

VOICES OF INDIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

VOICES OF INDIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

(VOICE OF MUSLIM ISOLATIONISM AND COMMUNALISM)

Muslim League Speaks 1926 – 1947

VOLUME X

Part Two

(Book 1)

Edited and Annotated by

J.C. JOHARI

M.A., LL.B., Ph.D.

AKASHDEEP PUBLISHING HOUSE

New Delhi (India)

1993

AKASHDEEP PUBLISHING HOUSE
4374/4B, Ansari Road
Daryaganj, New Delhi-110 002

PRINTED IN INDIA

Published by Akashdeep Publishing House, New Delhi-110002
and Printed at J.R. Printers, Delhi.

PREFACE

The history of the Indian freedom movement is mainly the history of the Indian National Congress that represented and reflected the real will of the people of the country. It is evident from the irrefutable fact that the people belonging to all parts of the country and professing different faiths and creeds joined the national organisation to take part in the freedom struggle and serve the country in the best possible manner. However, in opposition to this trend of progressive and constructive nationalism, some other trends of a sectarian and communal nature also grew which I have sought to include in different volumes with a view to maintain, as far as possible, the unity of a particular trend. A section of the Indian Muslim intelligentsia ridiculed and denigrated the aims and objects of the Indian National Congress from the very beginning and took to the ways of isolationism and exclusivism that led to the intensification of the trend of sectarianism and communalism and which eventially developed a secessionist character resulting in, what the historians of Pakistan proudly call, the triumph of Muslim nationalism.

After 1925 the Muslim League took a resolve to steer its own course basically and invariably opposed to the line of the Indian National Congress. When the Congress boycotted the Simon Commission (1928), the League rendered cooperation to it. In spite of the fact that the Nehru Committee prepared the framework of a model constitution for India, that was adjudged as the best possible effort yet devised by the Indian leaders to resolve the communal tangle, a powerful section of the League rejoiced at the failure of this great and sincere effort. The 14-Points of Jinnah (1929) exhibited a serious shift in his stand in as much as they cut across the line of liberal nationalism to which he had been committed so far. The idea of a separate and sovereign Muslim state faintly mooted by Iqbal in his presidential address delivered

at the Allahabad session of the League in 1930 could be acceptable to Jinnah after the bitter failure of the League in the elections of 1937 and he sought to justify the division of India in his logic of two-nations (Hindu and Muslim) in India in his presidential address delivered at the Lahore session of the League in 1940. Herein the British rulers discovered a handy and convenient instrument to punish the Congress for its crime of launching the 'Quit India Movement' and to reward the League for its cooperation rendered to it during the years of great crisis and distress. The patronage of the alien masters proved a blessing to the League that saw its paramount achievement in the creation of Pakistan. As such, I have put the matter in two parts. While Part I contains addresses delivered by the Presidents at the annual sessions of the League and also some important resolutions and documents related to the political developments of that period, Part II has important readings representing the British point of view.

I hope that my scheme would receive the appreciation of my readers who would find here much for the purpose of their advanced study or research in this important field of modern Indian history and politics. I have drawn material from numerous sources, Indian and foreign, according to my scheme and I offer my sincere gratitude to all of them. I am thankful to a large number of my friends for the help they extended to me in the completion of this project. In particular, I am thankful to my Publishers who appreciated this project and took pains to bring out the volumes in a record time.

—J. C. Johari

INTRODUCTION

A fundamental change in the nature of the role of the Muslim League occurred after 1925. After the bitter experience of the failure of the Khilafat movement for no fault of the Congress, the League never bothered for the cooperation of the Indian National Congress. In his presidential address delivered at the Delhi session of the League held in December, 1926, Sheikh Abdul Qadir frankly admitted : "The National Congress and the Muslim League which had made up their mind years ago to cooperate as far as possible, for the advancement of the general interest of the country, have now drifted very much apart from one another." More than this, the leaders of the League imputed bad motives to the cooperation which the Congress so willingly rendered to the League during the days of the Khilafat agitation. Sheikh Abdul Qadir went on to say: "The Muslims, who were keenly involved in the Khilafat Question, thought that the Congress would help them in saving the Khilafat, while a large number of Hindu politicians who professed sympathy with that cause tried to utilise the upheaval of Muslim sentiment for their own purposes, without desiring any lasting or business-like co-operation with Muslims."

The leaders of the Muslim League adhered to their demand for self-rule identifiable with Dominion Status and thus they did not endorse the case of complete independence as adopted by the Indian National Congress at its Madras session held in December, 1927. In his presidential address delivered at the Calcutta session of the League held in December, 1928, the Raja of Mahmudabad said: "There is yet an additional reason brushing aside the suggestion of 'Independence'. It lies in the fact that Dominion Status as contained and defined in the Nehru Report gives all the rights of citizenship, all the incidence of undiluted democracy, and all the requisites of

Muslim League Presidential Addresses

Sessions	*Dates*	*Venues*	*Presidents*	*Chairmen (Reception Committee)*
teenth	Dec. 29-31, 1926	Delhi	Sheikh Abdul Qadir	Pirzada Muhammed Hussain
Nineteenth[1]	Dec 30, 1927-Jan 1, 1928	Calcutta	Maulvi Mohammed Yakub	Mujibur Rahman
Nineteenth[2]	Jan. 1, 1928	Lahore	Muhammed Shafi	Nawab Zulfikar Ali Khan
Twentieth	Dec. 26-30, 1928	C lcutta	Raja of Mahmudabad	Moulvi Abdul Karim
Twenty-first	Dec. 29-30, 1930	Allahabad	Muhammed Iqbal	Muhammed Hussain
Twenty-second	Dec. 26-27, 1931	Delhi	Chaudhry Zafrullah Khan	Sheikh Muhammed Abdullah
Twenty-third	Oct. 21, 1933	Howrah	Mian Abdul Aziz	Ghulam Rabbani
Twenty-third[3]	Nov. 25-26, 1933	Delhi	Hafiz Hidayat Hussain	Haji Rashid Ahmed
Twenty-fourth	April 11-12, 1936	Bombay	Syed Wazir Hasan	Sir Currimbhoy Ibrahim
Twenty-fifth	Oct. 15-18, 1937	Lucknow	M.A. Jinnah	Raja of Mahmudabad
Special	April 17-18, 1938	Calcutta	M.A. Jinnah	Fazlul Haq
Twenty-sixth	Dec. 26-29, 1938	Patna	M.A. Jinnah	Syed Abdul Aziz
Twenty-seventh	March 22-24, 1940	Lahore	M.A. Jinnah	Nawab Shah Nawaz Khan
Twenty-eighth	April 12-15, 1941	Madras	M.A. Jinnah	Abdul Hamid Khan
Twenty-ninth	April 3-6, 1942	Allahabad	M.A. Jinnah	Nawab Muhammed Yusuf
Thirtieth	April 24-26, 1943	Delhi	M.A. Jinnah	Hussain Malik
Thirty-first	Dec. 24-26, 1943	Karachi	M.A. Jinnah	G.M. Syed

1. Jinnah Group 2. Shafi Group 3. Hidayat Group

political freedom that 'Independence' could confer. Adult suffrage, Central and Provincial governments responsible to the legislatures, with free and full control of the departments of national defence, foreign affairs and relations with the Indian States, guaranteeing the latter all the privileges and dignities are in all conscience sufficient foundation for building up a free Commonwealth of India. If these conditions of Dominion Status are obtained, it is incomprehensible why the vexed question of 'Independence' should be raised at all." Unfortunately, such a view about the nature of the Nehru Report could not carry conviction with all groups of the League and in the face of stiff opposition shown to it by the Shafi group, and also owing to the vacillating stand of the group led by the Agha Khan, the labours of the Nehru Commission failed to yield the desired dividends.[1] Some of the items of the 14-Points presented by the ambitious lawyer-politician Jinnah in 1929 could not be acceptable to the Congress [2] So the rejection of the Nehru Report enabled him

1. Even an English historian like Prof. Reginald Coupland, known for his anti-Indian feelings, endorsed the view of Mahatma Gandhi that the Hindu-Muslim unity brought about by the support of the Congress to the cause of the Caliphate could not have been possible in a hundred years to come. and the Nehru Report was the best attempt to solve India's communal problem. *The Constitutional Problem in India*, Part I, p. 73.
2. The Fourteen Points presented by Jinnah were: (i) a new constitution of India having a federal set up with residuary powers given to the Provinces, (ii) a uniform measure of autonomy to all units, (iii) adequate representation of the minorities in all legislatures of the country, (iv) one-third representation of the Muslims in the Central legislature, (v) at least one-third seats to the Muslims in Central and Provincial ministries, (vi) retention of separate electorate system, (vii) territorial redistribution without affecting Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal and the N.W.F P., (viii) full religious liberty for all people, (ix) veto power in the hands of 3/4 majority of any community in passing a bill affecting its religious interest, (x) separation of Sind from the Bombay Presidency, (ix) introduction of reforms in the provinces of Sind and Baluchistan, (xii) adequate share of the Muslims in public services and local bodies, (xiii) adequate safeguards for the protection and promotion of Muslim culture, and (xiv) constitutional amendments by the Centre with the concurrence of the Province . These Fourteen

Results of Provincial Assembly Elections (1937)

Provinces	*Total Seats*	*Gen. Seats*	*Seats Gained*			
			Cong.	*League*	*Ind.*	*Others*
Madras	215	116	159	11	—	45[1]
Bombay	175	99	88	20	10	57
C. P. and Berar	112	64	71	—	14	27
Bihar	152	71	98	—	15	39
U. P.	228	120	134	27	30	37[2]
Orissa	60	38	36	—	—	24
N.W.F.P.	50	9	19	—	2	29
Sind	60	18	7	—	—	53
Assam	108	40	35	9	14	50
Punjab	176	34	18	1	—	156[3]
Bengal	250	48	50	40	43	117[4]

1. It includes 17 members of the Justice Party.
2. It includes 16 members of the National Agriculturist Party.
3. Mostly of the Unionist Party.
4. It includes 38 members of the Krishak-Proja Party.

Assemblies held in January, 1937 gave such a terrible setback to the ambitions of Jinnah that he thought of realising the dream of a separate Muslim state as the only way to fulfil his ambition As a result of these elections, the League could not show its popularity in any province, while the Congress could have its government in 8 out of 11 provinces.[5] Naturally,

5. It is, however, a controversial point whether Jawaharlal Nehru committed a great mistake by refusing the entry of two Muslim Leaguers in the Government of U.P. save on the terms of total surrender, though the ground was made by leaders like Maulana Abul Kalam Azad (who was in-charge of U.P. elections) and others like Pandit Govind Vallabh Pant and Mohanlal Saksena By virtue of being the President of the Indian National Congress, Nehru ruled that the two members of the Muslim League could be included in the ministry of U.P. on the condition of ceasing

the League had to come out with the strategy of attacking the Congress rule on all possible counts surprisingly with the help of concocted material. In his presidential address delivered at the Lucknow session of the League held at Lucknow in October, 1937, Jinnah condemned Congress rule as 'Hindu tyranny' and ended with these words of exhortation: "Eighty millions of Musalmans in India have nothing to fear. They have their destiny in their hands and as a well-knit, solid, organised united force can face any danger, and withstand any opposition to its united front and opposition."[6]

---

to function as a separate group and of dissolving the Muslim League Parliamentary Board. But Jinnah was too ambitious a leader who, like Poincare of France, believed in the policy of all or none. Even if Nehru had acceded to the mission of Azad, nothing fruitful would have occurred, since as the supreme leader of a communal organisation, he would have thought of nothing else than what he actually did. The only result in that case had been that Nehru would have saved himself from such a charge. What was done by the members of the Muslim League both inside and outside the provincial Legislative Assemblies is sufficient to confirm the impression that they would have done the same even if Nehru had yielded to the wishes of Azad and Pant in so far as the case relating to the formation of ministry in U P. in coalition with the League (represented by Ismail Khan and Chaudhry Khaliquzamman) was concerned. On this point Nehru had frankly said on 30 March, 1937: "I am personally convinced that any kind of pact or coalition between us and the Muslim League will be highly injurious. It will mean many other things which are equally undesirable" See S. Gopal: *Jawaharlal Nehru: A Biography*, Vol. I, pp. 225-26. It may be added here that other Congress leaders like Azad and Pant had so desired on account of some casual understanding that had somehow developed on the eve of elections in view of the seemingly bright prospects of the National Agriculturist Party led by the Nawab of Chhatari. It was a pro-British Party that had jumped into the elections of 1937 and that had created a sort of fear for the Congress and the League alike. See Philip and Wainthright (eds.) : *Partition of India*, p. 384.

6. Pirzada observes that the Lucknow session (1937) "invigorated the Muslim League as a momentous decision was taken to change the League creed of full responsible government to full independence. Thus the conduct of the Congress rule went a long way in alienating

Naturally the exit of the Congress ministries in October, 1939 was hailed by the leaders of the Muslim League and they celebrated 'Deliverance Day' on 22 December, 1939. In his presidential address delivered at the Lahore session in March, 1940, Jinnah presented his two-nation theory and on that basis demanded a separate state of the Muslim nation. His argument was: "It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders. It is a dream that the Hindus and the Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits, and is the cause of most of our troubles, and will lead India to destruction, if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and the Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs and literature. They neither intermarry nor interdine together and indeed they belong to two different civilisations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. . . To yoke together two such nations under a single State, one as a numerical majority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and the final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state."

The Lahore League, thereupon, passed the 'epoch-making resolution' demanding partition of India to satisfy the demand of the Muslims for a separate nation-state of their own. This important impression should, however, not be lost sight of that what Jinnah demanded in the form of country's partition was not an entirely new development. It was the culmination of a point emphasised by a number of Muslim leaders and scholars in the past.[7] It had its natural germination in the Aligarh

the Muslims from the ideal of a united India and later popularised the ideal of Pakistan." *Op. cit.*, p. lxix.

7. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada asserts that by the time the All-India Muslim League was recognised under the leadership of M A. Jinnah, the partition idea had found its way into the thinking of various politicians and writers and the intelligentsia in general." *Foundations of Pakistan*, Vol. II, p. xviii.

movement that preached the gospel of Muslim isolationism and sectarianism. What had remained implicit and imbecile so far, Jinnah made it explicit and strong that eventually saw the triumph of his two-nation theory. It well synchronised with the colonial policy of the English rulers'who had reinforced their policy of divide and rule with the strategy of divide and quit. Pirzada boldly and proudly observes that the Lahore resolution "was the beginning of the end of the administrative unity of the entire sub-continent which had been created by the Muslim Emperors and continued by the British."[8]

Henceforth, the principal aim of the Muslim League became the achievement of a separate and sovereign state of Pakistan. It well signified that the demand for an 'Ulster' in the country was transformed into nothing short of a struggle for a separate and sovereign state comprising the Muslim majority provinces of India. The obduracy of the League in this regard went on increasing owing to the clandestine support of the British bureaucracy and the appeasement policy of the Congress leaders. The League thus rejected the Cripps Scheme of 1942, the Rajaji Formula of 1944, and the Cabinet Mission Plan of 1946, since all had set aside the case of Pakistan in clear-cut terms.[9] In stead it took to the strategy

8. *Ibid*, p. xi.

9. It may, however, be pointed out that the Cabinet Mission had not rejected the case of Pakistan in reality and in entirety. Patently it was done, not latently as the possibility of the creation of Pakistan was very much inherent in the scheme of the grouping of provinces into A, B and C zones. Zone A included the provinces of Bombay, Madras, Bihar, Orissa, U.P. and C.P. and Berar and there was no possibility of the creation of Pakistan in all these provinces. Zone B included Punjab, Sind and Baluchistan and the N.W.F.P. and Zone C included Assam and Bengal. These were all Muslim-majority areas and here the possibility could be explored in as much as the Cabinet Mission had given this right to the Provinces of each zone to think in terms of leaving the Indian Union after 10 years of the inauguration of the new constitution of India. The motives of the members of the Cabinet Mission are thus revealed by Pirzada: "The Mission was impressed by the

of 'direct action' in 1946 as a result of which communal massacres took place in different parts of the country that created conditions for the pragmatic leaders of the Congress to accept the Mountbatten Plan of 1947.

As now bent upon having India divided or destroyed, the League refused to associate itself with the Interim Government despite the fact that the Congress and other minor parties had accepted the proposal of Viceroy Lord Wavell and thereby joined it on 2 September, 1946. It was after protracted negotiations coupled with the patronising attitude of the Viceroy that the League joined the interim government towards the end of October, 1946 with a mind to get a foothold to fight for the cherished goal of Pakistan. By admitting the League into the interim government without first getting a declaration by it in favour of the Cabinet Mission Plan, it was a patent fact to see that the Viceroy was evidently encouraging the disruptive technique of the Muslim communalists turned secessionists. The statement of the British Prime Minister Attlee (dated 20 Feb., 1947) promising 'transfer of power to responsible Indian hands by a date not later than 30 June, 1948' came to the League as a boon that now redoubled its efforts to realise the dream of a Muslim homeland. It used this announcement "not for settling with the Congress peacefully and cooperatively but for creating conditions by coercion and intimidation in which certain decisions could be made in its favour."[10]

In pursuance of this principle, the League followed the tactics of launching a civil disobedience movement in the provinces where Muslim physical force was inadequate as well as of manoeuvring communal riots so as to coerce the

very genuine and acute anxiety of the Muslims that they might well find themselves subjugated to a perpetual Hindu-majority rule but found the demand for Pakistan impracticable. The Mission, nevertheless, offered the Muslim League in Zones B and C compulsory grouping of six provinces with considerable autonomy." *Foundations of Pakistan*, Vol. II, p. lxxiii.

10. *Indian National Congress: Report of General Secretaries* (Nov. 1946—Dec. 1948), p 11.

Congress to accept its demand for Pakistan. Hell was let loose on this earth in the form of communal riots and bloodshed and the British bureaucracy gave the proof of its callous role in effectively dealing with the situation. Thus came the Mountbatten Plan on 3 June, 1947. The League accepted it immediately and whole-heartedly for the obvious reason that the demand for Pakistan was conceded and more than that different courses were shown to ascertain the wishes of the Muslim majority areas ensuring their choice unfailingly in favour of the proposed Dominion of Pakistan. But, in the words of Sardar Patel, it was accepted by the Congress after 'deepest deliberations' and on the ground that it "was wisdom to remove a diseased limb lest the whole body should suffer.'[11] The final result was the success of the trend of sectarianism and anti-nationalism leaving Gandhi grumbling that it all occurred owing to the part of the 'third power' —the role of the English power that Muslims and Hindus were to be kept apart in order to facilitate the domination of India.[12]

—J.C. Johari

11. K.L. Panjabi: *The Indomitable Sardar*, p. 124.
12. A.R. Desai: *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, p. 41.

CONTENTS

PART I

MUSLIM LEAGUE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES (1926-1943)

As long as even some of the peculiar observances of Islam prevail in it, it is Dar-ul-Islam (Land of the Muslims).

—Jamal Ibn Abdullah Sheikh Omarul-Hanafi

It is written in the commentary of Dasoki that a Country of Islam (Dar-ul-Islam) does not become Dar-ul-Harb (Land of Struggle) as soon as it passes into the hands of the infidels, but only when all or most of the injunctions of Islam disappear therefrom.

—Hossain bin-Ibrahim

Mufti of the Maliki Sect of Mecca

1

UNITED AND VIGOROUS DEMAND FOR COMPLETE REFORMS*

I am deeply indebted to you for the great honour you have done me in electing me as the President of this important Session of the All-India Muslim League. This is a position which has been occupied by some of the ablest sons of India and one may feel a legitimate pride in receiving such a mark of confidence from one's community, but there is something in the intricate political situation of the country at present which makes the weight of this responsibility overwhelming, and it is with considerable diffidence that I have ventured to accept this onerous duty. We are passing through a momentous period of our political history and unfortunately the political organizations of our country are more or less in a state of chaos. The National Congress and the Muslim League, which had made up their mind years ago to co-operate, so far as possible, for the advancement of the general interests of the country, have now drifted very much apart from one another. That is not all. The Congress itself has been divided into several parties, and the Muslim League has suffered very much by differences of opinion within the community. The recent elections to the Provincial Councils and the Legislative Assembly have divided even the Swarajist Party of the Congress into two hostile camps and the Hindu Mahasabha has tried to oust the Swarajists from the influential position which they occupied a few years ago. This is a very distressing spectacle for any one interested in the

*Presidential address delivered by Sheikh Abdul Qadir at the Delhi Session held on 29-31 December, 1926.

welfare of the country; and the main question before us is to devise means of restoring normal conditions and of enabling various classes and communities in India to stand shoulder to shoulder with one another and to march onward together.

The fact that the All-India Muslim League has been invited this year to hold its annual sittings in this historic town, which is the ancient as well as the present capital of India, is an indication that the Muslims of Delhi are at last awakening to a sense of their great responsibility with regard to taking their due share in the political life of the country. I spent two very interesting years of my life in Delhi, at an early stage of my career as a lawyer, and had the privilege of coming in contact with some of the best men here and I have since taken a lively interest in the progress of this town. When the seat of the Government of India was transferred to Delhi, I felt, in common with many of its well-wishers, that Delhi was being given a unique chance of regaining its lost importance, but at the same time I felt that the level of intellectual activity here was not then sufficiently high to enable Delhi to take that part in guiding the policy of the country as befits its position, though the Hindus of Delhi were comparatively better prepared than the Muslims for taking part in politics. From the events that have been taking place since Delhi became the seat of Government, it is clear that the expectations as well as the fears referred to above have been realized. In point of importance and business prosperity, Delhi has undoubtedly gained; but its poverty in the sphere of intellectual and political development has been seriously felt as a drawback. Its enhanced status has brought with it new facilities for intellectual progress, and it is gratifying to see that Delhi has been given a University of its own, which has begun to function and has made quite a fair start. I am not sure that the Muslims of Delhi, most of whom are now engaged in trade or business, care sufficiently for education; and I must take this opportunity of impressing upon them the need of education, not only for the purpose of maintaining their present position in the commercial world, but also for taking their proper place in the domain of politics. Let us

hope that the Mohammedan Educational Conference, which has just concluded its sittings in Delhi, under the able guidance of Sir Abdul Rahim, will stimulate education among the Musalmans of this place and will help to equip them for taking part in political work. No community can properly appreciate political problems without there being a sufficiently large number of well-educated men in it, capable of giving a sane and sober lead in politics. The Musalmans of Delhi should make the fullest use of the opportunities before them by taking an adequate share in the work of their University, and thereby equip themselves for taking an intelligent interest in politics.

The All-India Muslim League, when it started in 1906, had before it a clear-cut policy, which had been decided upon by some of the best thinkers of the Muslim community in India, who combined a desire to safeguard the interests of their community with a patriotic fervour to serve the cause of the country in general. Some of those distinguished leaders have since passed away. I refer to men like the late Nawabs Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Viqar-ul-Mulk. We have still fortunately with us a towering personality like His Highness the Agha Khan, whose wise leadership proved very helpful in the early progress of the League. He was one of the eminent men who conducted the negotiations which finally resulted in the famous *entente* between Hindus and Musalmans, which is known as the Lucknow Pact of 1916. Owing to the numerous engagements of His Highness out of India, the League has not had, for some years past, that intimate touch with him which it had before. This is regrettable, but let us hope that the League will try to secure once more. not only the active interest and powerful support of H.H. the Agha Khan, but will strive to rally round its banner all that is good and great in Muslim India.

League and Congress Relations

The policy which had been adopted by the eminent founders of the League was that it should help the political advance-

ment of the country along with preserving the existence of Musalmans as one of the most important communities in India. There are many things in the Muslim religion, history and literature of which the Musalmans feel justly proud, and they would like to maintain their great heritage at any cost. The Muslim League has been trying to maintain the existing status of the Musalmans and at the same time to take part in advancing the general interests of the country. The League has supported from its platform many demands made by the Congress, which it recognized as conducive to the common good; but with regard to matters on which there was any conflict of interests between Hindus and Muslims, it advocated the interests of Musalmans. Whenever any matter was pressed strongly, both by the Congress and the League, a favourable impression was at once made on public opinion in this country as well as in England, and this united strength proved quite effective. I think if this line of action had been adhered to, both the Congress and the League would have been the better for it, and there would have been less friction among the two than there is today. Some of our prominent workers, however, tried to bring about a closer, though somewhat artificial union between the two, and began to have the sittings of both at one and the same place. This resulted in weakening the League without strengthening the Congress. It often happened that after the Congress had passed a number of resolutions on the questions of the day and its sittings were over, the League sat to draft a similar set of resolutions and to go through the formality of passing them with a much smaller attendance than the Congress. This reduced the proceedings of the League to a most uninteresting farce, and for some time it remained nothing but a feeble echo of the Congress.

The Congress itself found it more useful to co-operate with the two new associations which came into existence among the Musalmans when the question of preserving the Caliphate in Turkey became acute, namely the Khilafat Committee and the Jamat-ul-Ulema. The basis of this co-operation, however, was not sound. The Muslims, who were keenly involved in the

Khilafat question, thought that the Congress could help them in saving the Khilafat, while a large number of Hindu politicians, who professed sympathy with that cause, tried to utilize the upheaval of Muslim sentiment for their own purposes, without desiring any lasting or business-like co-operation with Muslims. It was commonly believed that Turkey would not any longer be a Power that would count for anything, and Hindu politicians freely expressed their sympathy with what they believed to be a lost cause. But when Turkey emerged out of the struggle in a fairly strong and healthy position, though with its dominions considerably reduced, a change came over their feelings, and their usually hostile attitude towards Muslims, which had been in abeyance under the protent influence of Mahatma Gandhi, began to reassert itself. The Mahatma, I think, had a genuine sympathy with Muslim sentiment and firmly believed that no political progress was possible without Hindu-Muslim unity; but a large number of his co-religionists did not share his views, and there has been a strong reaction against Mahatma Gandhi's policy. As a consequence of this reaction, the *Shuddhi* and the *Sanghatan* movements came into being. The Mahatma tried for some time to stem the rising tide of unhealthy communalism; but so far from succeeding in that effort, he began to lose his popularity and has had to seek a premature retirement from public life. Even those of us who do not agree with all his opinions or his methods of political work cannot but feel that the country is the poorer for the absence of his peace-loving influence from its politics. It is further regrettable that a broad-minded leader, like the late lamented Mr. C.R. Das, has been taken away from us by the cruel hand of death at a time when India stood sorely in need of the services of men of his type. He too, like Mahatma Gandhi, believed in the necessity of bringing the two great sections of the Indian people together.

Thus the work that was carried on by these two high-minded patriots has been interrupted and has been replaced by a counter-movement led by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Lala Lajpat Rai, which is taking us back to a state of

things, which we thought, we had permanently left behind. The attitude of hostility to Muslims on the part of the followers of the retrograde policy of the Hindu Sabha is very short-sighted and harmful to the cause of country as a whole. It is clear, however, that as long as this attitude continues there cannot be much hope of any real co-operation between Hindus and Muslims. I have every hope that it will no' last very long; but as long as it does last, there is only one path open to the Indian Muslims and that is an organized defence of their rights. An organization like the Muslim League, necessary as it was before, becomes doubly so when it appears to be essential for the preservation of our legitimate rights. We must take care, however, that any thing in the attitude of the Hindu Sabha towards us should not generate a spirit of narrow-mindedness among us, and we should continue to share and support all the legitimate aspirations of the people of India for attaining *Swaraj*, which has been recognized, both by the Congress and the League, as the common goal of our national ambitions.

Attitudes to Reforms

The word *Swaraj* has been shouted from numerous platforms for many years past, since the memorable year 1917, when the Scheme of Reforms was foreshadowed, and more particularly since 1920, when the Reforms were actually introduced. As you are all aware, a school of political thought condemned the Reforms, when they came, as absolutely inadequate, and decided to boycott the new Councils. Another school, while practically sharing the views of the former as to the inadequacy of the Reforms, urged that they should be worked for what they were worth. The voice of the letter was, however, overpowered by their more articulate brethren, and the results have been rather unfortunate for the country. The two sets of politicians, instead of showing a united front to the bureaucracy, from whose hands they wanted to snatch the greater part of the power hitherto enjoyed by it, began to quarrel among themselves. The extreme wing

of the Congress denounced those who wanted to work the Reforms and insisted that we should at once have full autonomy like the other dominions of the British Empire. They were not willing to serve the proposed probation before getting any further steps in autonomy. At the first elections to the newly constituted Councils, the boycott appreciably affected the situation. When the second elections came, the non-co-operators relaxed their ban to some extent, but insisted that those going to the Councils should go there in order to wreck them. This, however, did not succeed, and now many of them have come in as responsivists. My purpose in drawing attention to these three stages of what has been known as the 'Non-co-operation Movement' is to show that in the hopeless endeavour to accelerate the pace of the reforms, some of our leaders have actually retarded their progress. If the ablest men of the country had from the outset put their heads together and had united to work the Reforms, notwithstanding their inadequacy, the country would have been in a much stronger position to demand self-government. The Royal Commission, which is expected to re-examine the question of the Reforms in 1929, may commence its work even earlier, but the spectacle that we should present to the Commission is that of differences and divisions, of struggles and strifes, of internecine quarrels and inter-communal riots and disturbances. I do not wish to blame any particular party or individual for all this, I am afraid we are all to blame, more or less. I have referred to this matter simply to ask all my countrymen to effect some improvement in the existing situation before it is too late. If between 1927 and 1929 we do not behave more reasonably than we have done during the past six years, the future appears to be very gloomy. If however, we spend the next three years in doing constructive instead of destructive work, in uniting the various communities in India instead of disuniting them, and in reforming our own social and economic conditions, we will stand a fair chance of getting a substantial advance in our rights aud privileges.

Proposals for Round-Table Conference

The first thing to do for the Congress and the Muslim League, as the two leading political associations of the country, would be to arrange a Round Table Conference of the selected representatives of both, at some central place, as was done in 1916 when the Lucknow Pact was sealed. I have no doubt that the first instalment of Reforms that we got was materially helped by the agreement that had been arrived at between the two communities. This is evidenced by the fact that the proportions which had been agreed upon at Lucknow, by Hindus and Musalmans with mutual consent, were adopted mainly as the basis of decision by those responsible for framing the Montagu-Chelmsford Scheme. There has been a feeling since, on both sides, that in certain respects the Lucknow Pact requires revision or modification, and if we come together again there should be no difficulty in making any necessary readjustments. It is obvious that a new understanding, or a confirmation of the principles underlying the old understanding with some modifications, would considerably facilitate the introduction of further reforms, while without any such *entente* there would be no end of troubles before us. Though it is difficult to anticipate how the Congress will receive such an offer, I feel it to be my duty, as an Indian and as a Musalman, to express from this platform the readiness of Musalmans to confirm or renew the Pact, as may be decided after due discussion, and to stretch the hand of fellowship and friendliness towards my Hindu countrymen, in the hope that they will see the advantage of grasping it and negotiating terms in a neighbourly spirit of give and take.

The most important question that will have to be discussed at the Round Table Conference, if it is held, will be that of adequate representation of the Musalmans in the Assembly and the Councils and other public bodies. The Muslims are in a minority in India; and so far as the Legislative Assembly is concerned, their representation can scarcely be regarded as adequate or effective. They are also in a minority in most of

the provinces of India, where they were given a representation somewhat above their proportion in the population, as a result of the understanding arrived at in Lucknow. The increased proportion cannot help them to carry out their wishes, but creates contentment. There are only three provinces in which the Musalmans constitute the majority, namely Bengal, the Panjab and the N.W.F.P. Of these, the last named is still waiting for the introduction of reforms. Under the Lucknow Pact, Bengal got much less than its share, according to the proportion of Muslims in its population; and a part of its share and that of the Punjab was taken away to raise the proportion in other provinces, where the non-Muslims were in the majority. There is a strong feeling in the Punjab, and I believe in Bengal as well, that if a readjustment of proportions is made, the principle adopted should be that the majorities and minorities in every Province, whether they consist of Hindus or Musalmans, should have equal chances everywhere. If non-Muslim majorities in most Provinces have the chance of an effective control of their affairs, there is no reason why the same privilege should not be extended to Provinces where the Muslims dwell in larger numbers. There should, of course, be proper safeguards to protect the interests of the minorities everywhere, so that there may be as little temptation as possible for the majority to take undue advantage of its numbers or to abuse its powers. I do not think that there can be any honest difference of opinion as to the fairness of this proposition; and I think both the communities would really be well advised if they adopt this principle as their guide.

There is one difficulty, however, in the way of this readjustment, which has to be faced. The Hindus urge, and not unreasonably, that in case there is a revision on the line suggested above, the increased representation that was given to provinces in which Musalmans form a minority, will have to be taken away. I think we must recognize that if an all-India settlement is to be brought about, we cannot justly insist on retaining the increase, when asking for our due proportion in

provinces where our population is greater. There is now a growing volume of opinion in favour of the view that the small increase in representation which we get in Provinces like Bombay, Madras and the U.P. leaves us very much in minority still and does not prove of much practical assistance, while it tends to reduce our majorities in Bengal and the Punjab to the level of minorities. It will be for the Muslims in the minority Provinces to decide whether they are prepared to sacrifice the increase that they got under the Pact of 1916 for the sake of helping their brethren in the majority Provinces, and enabling them to take the benefit of their numbers, or would prefer the existing state of things to continue in spite of the detrimental effect it has on large Muslim populations. If they agree to a revision of the existing proportions, it would be to the advantage of the Muslim community as a whole to have them revised. But if they are not prepared to give up the nominal advantage secured by them, then we should made up our minds in a manly way, to stand by the decision arrived at in 1916 and make the best of our position on the basis of existing circumstances.

Joint and Separate Electorates

While it is generally recognized by all sensible Hindu leaders that Muslims are entitled to a fair representation, the prevailing opinion among them is that much representation should be given through mixed or joint electorates. They say that a certain number of seats in a particular Province may be reserved for Muslims, but they may be elected by a joint electorate of Muslims and non Muslims. It is argued by them that this arrangement would be more conducive to the building up of a common nationality and will have the result of putting in men who will command the confidence of both the communities. I must concede that in theory this proposal appeals to one better than the system of separate electorates for Hindus and Musalmans, on which the Musalmans as a class are so keen. English people who are in sympathy with Indian aspirations also find this view more acceptable and often observe that separate elec-

am not one of those who think that separate electorates will be necessary for all time to come, but I am certainly of the opinion that they must be retained as long as the present atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion continues and calls for this practical device for preserving peace between various communities.

It has become a fashion in some quarters to attribute all our troubles to separate electorates and to describe them as one of the causes of the present tension. There could be nothing more misleading than that, and I hope the question will be coolly and dispassionately considered by all well-wishers of the country, whether they are Europeans or Indians, officials or non-officials, and a correct judgment will be formed after a close scrutiny of the facts of the case. Some recent utterances of His Excellency the Viceroy have caused some apprehension among Musalmans as to his attitude towards separate electorates. I want to take this opportunity of impressing on the Government of India and the Government in England the necessity of recognizing that Muslims are firmly convinced of the fact that their interests can be safeguarded in the present circumstances only by continuing separate electorates for them till the time when their Hindu countrymen begin to treat them with such fairness and equity that they may themselves apply for the removal of this and other safeguards which are absolutely necessary in the period of transition through which we are passing.

Muslim State in the Administration of the Country

The discussion of Muslim representation in Councils and other bodies brings me to a consideration of another vexed question, on which the position of Musalmans is very much misunderstood, sometimes by officials, sometimes by our Hindu countrymen, and very often by both. The Musalmans claim their proper share in the administration of the country. This is essentially the same demand which the Congress has been making for years on behalf of the people of India as a whole, with reference to their proportion in the higher services as

compared with that of European officials. The reply of the bureaucracy to the Indian demand used to be that the larger proportion of Europeans in the higher offices of the State was due not only to any preference on the ground of race or colour, but because of the higher ability and efficiency of the European officials. The Congress challenged the correctness of this view, and it is now being recognized that India has no dearth of ability or talent and can supply efficient and capable public servants for every department of service.

It is a strange irony of fate that after trying for nearly half a century to establish the capability of Indians, some of our Hindu countrymen, even among those professing the Congress creed, should turn round and say that ability is confined to one section among the Indians themselves, and that predominance of Hindus in offices of State should continue because the Musalmans lack ability and efficiency. It is true that there is much larger number of educated Hindus than Musalmans, and when there is any vacancy in any Government department, the number of Hindus applying for it is larger than that of Musalmans. The causes of this are obvious. The Hindus are more numerous in the population. They have more men who can afford to get higher education, and they have had the advantage of an earlier start, so far as Western education is concerned; but in most of our universities Muslims have shown that, man to man, they are not intellectually inferior to any of their Hindu compatriots, and they have held their own in competition with them in various subjects of study. Therefore, if the principle of giving them a fair play was frankly recognized, much of the resentment and heart-burning that is to be found to-day and which is one of the most potent causes of friction would vanish. Let the standard of qualifications for a particular position in public service be fixed, and let the proportion of Hindus and Musalmans and members of other communities in particular departments, or in a particular province, be also determined according to the requirements of that department or Province, and then let an earnest effort be made to give each

community its due, if it can produce candidates possessing the required qualifications. In judging the relative merits of candidates, regard should be had not only to their position in examination, which no doubt furnishes one valuable test of their capacity, but attention should also be paid to other qualities which are not of lesser value in actual life—for example, character, family traditions and physical fitness.

It may not be out of place in this connection to refer to a commonly prevailing misunderstanding on the question of State service. Some newspapers as well as some politicians try to make out that it is not patriotic to lay any stress on proportionate representation of various classes in the Public Services. It is argued that services cannot give employment even to one per cent of the population, and we should look to the interests of the 99 per cent, who earn their livelihood without taking any services under the Government. This argument was once put forward from this very platform some years ago, in this very town, by one of my predecessors. Perhaps he has since had occasion to modify his opinion on this subject; but if he has not, I must say, with due deference to him, that I beg to differ from this view. The question of employment under the State is not merely a question of loaves and fishes, as is usually observed. It is a question of power and opportunity and of training. The officials in this country has been wielding and, in spite of the changing times, still continue to wield great power, which they can use to the advantage of one party and to the disadvantage of the other, and such occasions it becomes a matter of very vital interest to the communities concerned whether the persons in powers, at a particular time or in a particular locality, belong to one community or the other. They have opportunities of rendering services to those whom they want to help; and if one community has a much larger number of helpers than the other, it makes a difference not only to its present but to its future. Moreover, even as a pure question of bread and butter, it is not one to be despised or to be treated as affecting a very small portion of people. Very often one individual in India who is the bread-winner of

a family supports a large number of relatives and dependents; and therefore, for very thousand men who may be in service, there are several thousands who are being cared for. The vitality of this question gains still greater force in the case of Musalmans, because some other avenues of work, particularly in the line of trade or commerce, are practically beyond the reach of most of them for want of sufficient capital, as well as on account of the greater aptitude of the Hindus for those walks of life acquired by heredity. It is, therefore, necessary that the Government as well as our fellow-countrymen may recognize the justness of our demand for a fair share of employment under the State.

Religious Differences

Besides the two important matters which have been dealt with above, the equestion of religious differences is one which requires the most careful attention. Instead of being the means of peace and goodwill among men, which every religion professes to be, it has often proved a source of trouble in the world, and India is not the only country which has suffered through religious differences. There have been attempts made from time to time to reconcile the jarring elements of religion in India, but the attempts have often resulted in failure. There have been dreamers among Muslims who conceived it possible that Islam might become the universal religion of India. There are now dreamers among some sections of the Hindu community who think that if they make sufficient efforts they might convert all the followers of Islam in this country to Hinduism and thus create a new nation. But I think it must be frankly recognized on both sides that these two great religions have got to live side by side and cannot destroy one another. The vast majority of Musalmans love their faith much too well to give it up for any worldly considerations; and similarly the Hindus, with the modern awakening among them and the revived consciousness of the beauties of their own ancient philosophy, are not likely to change their religion for any other. The only rational course open to the two parties is

mutual toleration and respect for the feelings of one another. Many of our recent troubles would have been avoided, if we had a spirit of toleration. The question of music before the mosques, which has caused so much bitterness of late, furnishes a striking instance of intolerance on both sides. One can understand the excitement of the masses on a question of this nature, but it is difficult to understand leaders of political thought among Hindus insisting that Hindus have a right to play music before mosques, *including prayer times*, and similarly Muslim leaders saying that a procession with music may not pass before a mosque *at any time*. Such Hindus should realize that, apart from any question of usage or law, mere decency dictates that if you pass a place of worship you have to pass it reverently, especially when there are people engaged in religious devotion. A European walks on tip-toe, so as to avoid making a noise, if he passes a place where a few people are holding a meeting and, for the matter of that, so does the educated Indian, if he has received the least training in manners There is no law that enjoins this, but the man who does so shows his own good breeding and elicits respect from those who witness such a move on his part. The Hindus should therefore adopt this spirit and treat a congregation assembled for prayers with at least as much regard as they would pay to a meeting assembled to transact worldly business. The Muslims, on the other hand, should learn to abandon that attitude of tetchiness which characterizes them now-a-days, of smelling an insult even when no insult is meant and of becoming easily provoked. The Sikhs of Delhi set up a very admirable example the other day, in this respect, in connection with the procession which they had organized and have thereby earned the thanks of the Muslims here and everywhere. The school of thought that believes that any good can come out of these unseemly squabbles which arise when one party insists on making the maximum of noise before a place of worship and the other wants to stop it by force is entirely in the wrong, and the sooner we can get away from the influence of such ill-advised wire-pulling the better it would be for all concerned.

Another problem which has been longer with us than the problem of musical processions is that of the protection of cows. As you all know a large number of Hindus are very sensitive on this point. I am not concerned here with the merits of the question, but wish only to point out that if cow-killing cannot be prevented on 364 days of the year, it passes one's comprehension why it should be so provoking on the one day when Muslims resort to it in certain places as a part of a religious ceremony. The Hindus may reasonably insist on due precautions being taken to respect their feelings and on avoiding any exposure of the meat or the public sacrifice of cows, but there should be no reasonable objection of Muslims performing their ceremony of sacrifice inside their houses and with proper safeguards.

Before I pass on to other subjects, I may pause to mention one more topic connected with Hindu-Muslim relations. It is generally observed by writers in the Hindu Press, and by some speakers among them, that the Muslims are not sufficiently interested in the affairs of their motherland because of their extra-territorial sympathies with their co-religionists abroad. They go even further and say that a number of Muslims desire to bring the Afghans or any other of the neighbouring Muslim people into India and to introduce Muslim rule in the country. I do not know a single Musalman in any responsible public position who entertains any such fantastic idea or believes in its possibility. In fact, there are many who think that such a possibility would be fraught with danger to the whole country and would adversely affect the interests of all communities residing in it. This theory seems to be the product of the heated brains of a few faddists, and is propagated in order to wean Hindus from nationalism and to work upon their fears for party purposes. This tendency should be deprecated with all the emphasis at our command, and I hope all sensible Hindus will refuse to be misled by such mischievous propaganda. As to the sympathy of Muslims with the members of their faith in other countries, it is no different in its nature to the sympathy which some Christian nations in Europe show

towards other Christian nations in their troubles, and is only natural. It does not interfere with the equally natural affection which the Indian Musalmans have for the land of their birth and which is further strengthened by strong bonds of self-interest. I hope our countrymen will accept our assurance of our devotion to the interests of our country with the same sincerity with which we offer it.

Forthcoming Commission on Reform

I have dwelt at great length on some practical aspects of inter-communal relations, because I think that it is essential that some way out of our present difficulties may be found. I shall now refer briefly to some other matters of importance, which await consideration. I shall at first take up the forthcoming Commission on Reform. I think it must be recognized by all parties that the Reforms have probably come to stay, whether we like them or not. At the time when they were about to be introduced, the bulk of the Musalmans were apprehensive that the results would not be very conducive to their welfare, because they were not as well prepared to work them as were some of the more advanced sections of their fellow-countrymen. Experience has shown that the apprehensions were not unfounded, and that Muslim interests have suffered even in Provinces where the Muslims were in the majority. The Muslims of Bengal can hardly feel that they are the better for having obtained an enlarged Council under the new scheme. The Musalmans of the Punjab, though commonly believed to have a strong position in their Provincial Council, are not, in reality, any stronger than they were before the Reforms. In fact in some respects their position has been very much weakened. Though the Hindu press in the Punjab has been endeavouring to make out that they have serious grievances in this Province, yet there is more of skilful and significant propaganda behind that statement than any real or substantial grievance. A change that has been brought about by the new scheme in the Punjab is that the Sikhs have definitely put forward a claim to be regarded as a community distinct from the

Hindus. I well remember a time when the expression of any such sentiment was objected to by the Hindus of the Punjab, and the Government used to be accused of trying to separate the Sikhs from the Hindus in order to weaken the latter. The more advanced among the Sikhs also used to declare that they were one of the many sects that have sprung up from Hinduism, but this should not mean that they can be detached from the Hindus. This is not less true to-day than it was before, but the advantage of having separate representation in the Council and the prospect of having a more than substantial share in the administration, independently of their numerical proportion, have induced them to set up their new claim. They have found the Government willing to recognize it for its own reasons and the Hindus willing to agree to it for their own purposes, because it virtually adds to the strength of the Hindu position in the Punjab. This has complicated the situation, vitally affecting the interests of Musalmans. A strange commentary on the so-called strength of the Muslims of the Punjab is furnished by the fact that during the year that is just ending the Punjab has remained without a Muslim Minister, simply because a tried administrator of the capacity of the Hon'ble Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain was chosen by Government as an Executive Councilor in place of Sir Sundar Singh of Majitha, who had occupied that position for five years. Exception was taken to this by many Muslim Associations and newspapers, but their voice remained unheeded. It is further regrettable that in the newly formed Council also the transferred subjects are probably going to be administered without Muslims having a share in that administration. In spite of such disadvantages, however, I think that we cannot but take our chances under the circumstances which now exist, and should work on the hypothesis that it is impossible to go back to pre-Reform conditions. We should therefore try and prepare ourselves for fighting our battles constitutionally to secure our rights in these reforms.

I believe that the main responsibility for the losses sustained by us is our own. We are not sufficiently organized or united, and as long we allow these sources of weakness to continue,

we cannot expect to hold our own against stronger and better organized communities. We should thoroughly overhaul our organization, and ask the Commission to give us an adequate share of any advance in autonomy. We should also ask for a restoration of our majority strength in provinces where our numbers are larger than those of others. We should emphasize the necessity of reforms being introduced in the N.W.F. Province, which, by the homogenity of the greater portion of its population, is in a better position than most other provinces to work the reforms satisfactorily.

Organization and Overcoming Differences in the Muslim Community

Organization is not an easy task. Though the All-India Muslim League and some of its Provincial Branches have managed to retain their existence in spite of the adverse circumstances through which they have passed, it must be admitted that most of their branches in districts have been practically defunct. It should be our first duty, on our return to our homes, after the conclusion of this Session of the League, to form active branches of it everywhere. We must raise funds to carry on, not only the routine work of the League and its branches, but also to pay the expenses of conducting its propaganda on an extensive scale. No movement can thrive now-a-days without an adequate propaganda to push it, and we cannot afford to neglect this necessary work any longer. After the requisite repairs of the machinery of the League, we should turn to the task of co-ordinating the work of some kindred institutions like the Khilafat, the *Jamiat* and the *Tanzim* An All-Parties Conference of public workers among the Muslims was convened at Amritsar in the summer of 1925, through the efforts of our friend Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlew, and it came to a very sensible decision that different associations among the Musalmans should give up unheaithy rivalries and should help one another, each working in its own particular line to ameliorate the condition of the community. It was understood that the Muslim League should continue to

be responsible for organizing the Indian Muslims politically, while the Khilafat should devote itself mainly to the relations of Indian Musalmans with their brethren in faith in foreign lands. The existing Educational Associations were to remain in charge of educational work, while the Jamiaat was to concentrate on religious progress. The task of organizing the community socially and economically was to be entrusted to the newly constituted *Tanzim* movement. I think it would have been fortunate for the community if the leaders assembled at Amritsar had in practice carried out this decision; but tresspassing on the dominions of one another has not ceased, and the leaders have allowed their individual ambitions and personal inclinations to over-ride the interests of the community, till things have come to such a pass that the Central Khilafat Committee and some of its Provincial Branches are estranged from one another. What is still worse is that the workers of the Central Khilafat and of its Punjab Branch are abusing one another in the columns of newspapers. There is another extremely regrettable quarrel going on in Delhi itself between some prominent leaders. I am sure most of us have been grieved to see the abusive writings which this regrettable controversy has produced. Some of the expressions printed in black and white are such that even the man in the street should feel ashamed of uttering them. I appeal to the parties concerned to have some regard for their own position, if not for the morals of the readers of their papers. Each one of them says that he wants to crush the other in public interests, but I am afraid that it is the public that will suffer by this fratricidal fight. Perhaps it may be useful if an influential deputation or a largely signed written representation be sent to these gentlemen, on behalf of the community, to request them to stop internal strife and to devote themselves to the cause of the community, which stands in great need of solid work and can ill-afford indulgence in fruitless quarrels.

It must be said to the credit of Dr. Kitchlew that ever since he realized the necessity of constructive work and started the

Tanzim movement, he has kept his ideal before him and has not taken any part in the game of mutual destruction that is going on in some quarters. It is a pity, however, that the *Tanzim* has not made the progress that was expected of it, because people are not sufficiently trained to appreciate quiet and solid work and because Dr. Kitchlew has been practically single handed in his efforts. And many of those who were enthusiastic about him when he was advocating the process of revolution left his side when he began to preach evolution. One more movement may be specially noticed, and that is the *Tabligh.* It has always existed in theory, but it came into action as a measure of defence when the *Shuddhi* movement gathered strength. It has received plenty of lip-homage from Musalmans, but the financial support has not been at all commensurate with the amount of talk that has been indulged in. To this movement I venture to offer a word of advice, and that is that if they wish to convey the message of Islam to the world, they should make it a true message of peace, and should try to attract people by laying before them the beauties of their own religion rather than by exposing the real or imaginary weaknesses of others.

Having said something about different movements among the Musalmans in this country, I may refer in passing to one of the external events that have stirred the Muslim community during the current year. This year has been the rise in supremacy of His Majesty Amir Ibn Saud in the Kingdom of Hedjaz. Ordinarily one should have expected that the Muslims of India would be gratified at any prospect of a settled government in Arabia, which would enable them to perform their pilgrimage with safety and ease, but unfortunately the domes of some sacred tombs were injured by the solidiery of Ibn Saud, and this excited the feelings of Muslims in this country. This divided the Muslims of India into two hostile camps, one expressing indignation at the sacreligious demolition of domes, and the other supporting the action of Ibn Saud on religious grounds. This controversy is still raging and the division between the Hanafis and the Ahl-i-Hadis on this point has become more acute than it has ever been since the beginning of the

new century. Within the last few months the tension has assumed another form; and now there is a difference of opinion as to whether Indian Musalmans should go to perform their pilgrimage when the supreme power is in the hands of Ibn Saud. Propaganda is being carried on by some that this year the pilgrimage should be abandoned. All this is very unfortunate. I do not desire to take the side of any party in this quarrel; but I have no hesitation in saying that I regard all pressure on intending pilgrims by one party or the other as an undue interference with the liberty of individuals. The pilgrimage to Mecca, like any other religious duty enjoined by Islam, is a matter of conscience, and every Muslim should be left free to arrange his pilgrimage according to the dictates of his conscience, with due regard to his convenience and circumstances. Unless it can be made out that any regime in Arabia is placing difficulties in the way of pilgrimage or is not giving due facilities to pilgrims, those outside Arabia have hardly any business to condemn it. To my mind the Musalmans of India should realize the limitation of their rights and privileges with regard to other Muslim countries, and should not assume the role of dictators of policy to nations with whom their only tie is that of kinship in religion. They must also learn to understand that their first duty, as Musalmans, is to their co-religionists in this country, and any Indian Muslim, who neglects to do his duty by them on the pretence that he is more enthusiastic for the welfare of his brethren in faith abroad can be neither a patriotic Musalman nor a true Indian. I implore all who are engaged in these controversies to devote their energies to something more profitable and more likely to yield tangible results. There is plenty of work to be done in this country for the uplift of India and for the improvement of Musalmans, and while that is suffering for want of devoted workers, it is hardly right that some of our most energetic men should be spending their time and incidentally the time and money of the community, on fostering strife and spreading dissensions.

Economics and the Need to Pay More Attention to it

Among the problems that are agitating the mind of the country just now is a very difficult economic question of currency, relating to the fixing of the rate of exchange of Indian and English money. Most of you must undoubtedly have followed the discussions that have been going on in the press and on the platform since the publication of the report of the Currency Commission and the minute of dissent by Sir Parshotamdas Thakardas. I am not, unfortunately, an expert in economics, and in a case where experts differ so acutely, it will be imprudent on my part to offer any opinion as to the views advanced on either side. Currency Leagues are being founded by representatives of Commerce in various centres of India to support the non-official view, while the opinion of the majority of the Commission is receiving strong support from Government, and Sir Basil Blackett, the Finance Member of the Government of India, is vigorously advocating the advantages to India of adopting the rate recommended by the majority of the Commission. It is for those among us who have made a special study of economics, and who are in a position to weigh the relative advantages and disadvantages of the two proposals, to form an opinion on the subject and to make some useful contribution to the solution of the problem. We should have a branch of this League devoting itself particularly to a consideration of economic questions, which are often tied up with political problems, and are an essential part of modern politics, Musalmans as a class have not, so far, given that attention to economics which the importance of the subject deserves, and unless they make a special effort to improve themselves in this respect, both in theory and practice, any effort to secure their advancement in the sphere of politics, pure and simple, will fail to do them much good.

There is a topic connected with economic progress which I should like to touch before concluding my speech, and that is industrial development. There is universal agreement as to the

need of such development. Hindus as well as Musalmans stand in need of it. In fact Musalamans require it even more urgently than others. There has been some development in this direction during recent years, but it has been mainly brought about by official initiative. The people or their political leaders have done comparatively very little in this direction. Agriculture is the principal industry in this country, and a large number of the poorer agriculturists, especially in my province, are Musalmans. The movement which is calculated to help the agriculturists is the Co-operative Movement, and it has been remarkably successful in the Punjab. It is giving the zemindars a valuable training in the management of their own affairs. I understand that it is doing well in other provinces also, and notably in Bombay, but the Movement should become much more universal, and its work should be intensified before we can derive from it all the benefits that it is capable of yielding. I should urge the adoption of the co-operative idea by private societies and by classes other than agriculturists, such as the poorer class of townsmen and artisans.

One of the main industries, which has for ages supported hundreds of thousands of people in India is the handloom industry, and a very large number of artisans engaged in it consist of those professing the Muslim faith. It is surprising that very few Musalmans have given any thought or attention to helping this industry. The Congress, under the influence of Mahatma Gandhi, laid great stress on popularizing the use of *Khaddar* (home-made cloth) by the public. I have always been of opinion that this was one of the most useful things advocated by Gandhi, but I am afraid the way in which the propaganda in its favour was not conducive to bringing about any permanent result. Mahatma Gandhi, in his zeal for Swadeshi goods, carried his idea too far when he preached that, in this advanced age of machinery, people should make a creed of plying the spinning wheel. He insisted not only that women may once more adopt the old and favourite occupation of their grand-mothers, but that men should also engage for some

time every day in spinning as a measure of discipline. This brought about a reaction, and a large number of even those who had passed a resolution to this effect in the Congress began to revolt against the adoption of this idea in practice. Similarly the use of *Khaddar*, as to which many eminent leaders of the Congress and the Khilafat set an example worthy of imitation, began to lose in popularity, because those wearing *Khaddar* made the mistake of forcing people to adopt its use, instead of persuading them to do so and also made *Khaddar*-wearing a sort of ritual. At one time a man could hardly be admitted to a political meeting without a *Khaddar* uniform, and a *Khaddar* shirt or a *Khaddar* cap became a garment which several hypocrites began to use—'the white apparel that can cover seventy sins', as the proverb in India goes. This resulted in weakening the *Khaddar* propaganda instead of strengthening it. But now it is high time that those who believe in the forces of persuasion proving, in the long run, stronger than the forces of coercion, may come forward and place the popularity of home-made goods in India on a rational and business-like basis. This is the work which the Congress as well as the League, and for the matter of that, all other public movements in the country, may combine to undertake.

Conclusion

Gentlemen, I have taxed your patience very much, and am grateful to you for giving me your attention. I do not want to detain you much longer and will sum up what I have said. First of all, both the Congress and the League should each put its own house in order and try to bring within their respective fold all the sheep that have gone astray. Then they should both come together and devise ways and means of acting in harmony wherever possible, and of agreeing to differ in a friendly way when such difference becomes inevitable. Having accomplished this, they should stand together before the coming Commission on Constitutional Reforms and make a united and vigorous demand for complete reforms. In the meanwhile, as a preparation for that, they should work hand in hand

in spheres of intellectual, economic and industrial progress. If we succeed in doing all this, we shall be proving to the outside world that we are capable of managing our own affairs and achieving that ideal which the late Mr. Gokhale, one of the soundest politicians that India has produced, used to express in very simple words by saying that all that Indians desire is that we should be in our country what other nations are in their own.

Before I resume my seat, it is my melancholy duty to refer to the tragic event which has not only cast its gloom on Delhi, but has occasioned great indignation throughout the country. I mean the outrage of which the late Swami Shradhanand was the victim. This deserves to be denounced in the most unmistakable terms by every right-thinking Indian, whether he is a Hindu or a Musalman, and I do so most emphatically on behalf of you all as well as on my own behalf. We have assembled here under the shadow of this serious tragedy which must act as a damper on the spirits of even the optimists among us. The first impression that is made on one's mind by an occurrence like this is that of despondence; but while deeply regretting the dastardly murder of the Swami, I venture to ask all my countrymen, and particularly the members of the Hindu community, to control their feelings and to keep the general question of relations between the communities separate from this cowardly deed of a misguided individual. There were many Musalmans who had differences with Swami Shradhanand over his religious propaganda, but I am sure they will be as sorry as others to find that a co-religionist of theirs should take it into his head to put an end to his life. The man could not have rendered a greater disservice to Islam or lent a stronger impetus to the *Shuddhi* propaganda than he has done by this foul deed.

2

UNITY THROUGH GIVE AND TAKE*

Moulvi Mahommad Yakub was applauded when he rose to deliver his Presidential Address extempore in Urdu. He apologized for not delivering a written address because of the short notice. He would speak in his mother tongue. He expressed gratitude for this opportunity to serve his community, particularly because Calcutta was one of the foremost cities of the world, and was also the home of his ancestor who held the position of a vizier over a century ago.

The session was meeting under the gloom cast by the death of Hakim Ajmal Khan. Hakim Sahib had worked wholeheartedly for Hindu-Muslim unity; and just before he died, he had observed a ray of that unity emanating from Madras.

Their homage to Hakim Sahib should take the form of pursuing the object of unity, which the late Hakim had so much at heart. From the time of the inception of the League, he had been one of its leading lights and had twice presided over League sessions.

The President also mourned the death of Syed Alay Nabi.

League Session Controversy

Proceeding, the President said that for over two weeks a controversy had been going on concerning the question of

* An indirect version of the Presidential address delivered by Moulvi Mohammad Yakub (Jinnah Group) at the Calcutta session held on 30 December, 1927—1 January, 1928.

whether the session should be held in Lahore or Calcutta. He said that, according to the League's Constitution, voting could not be by proxy nor could it be through telegrams addressed to a third person. The first meeting voted for Lahore through votes obtained mostly by proxy, and in this connection Malik Feroze Khan Noon had played a leading part. Dr. Kitchlew, the Secretary, felt obliged not to accept the illegal decision; and even if he had not recorded the request for a revision from Madras and Calcutta, Dr. Kitchlew would, in accordance with the sacred provisions of the Constitution, have been justified in calling another meeting. This second meeting was called; but the dispute had made it difficult for the self-respecting Aga Khan to accept the presidentship. The second meeting gave the final decision, and Calcutta was decided upon as the venue of the Session.

Moulvi Yakub said that Mr. Jinnah had urged every one not to commit himself on the question of the Simon Commission, but the Lahore Muslim League was the first to give its views, under Sir Muhammad Shaffi's chairmanship. How then, could Sir Muhammad Shafi be expected to change his views, unless he acted as he did in respect of his views on the Muddiman Committee, which he changed after he became a member of the Government.

The President next read out the Constitutional Provision that the annual session shall be held as decided by the Council of the League. How, then, could the Council's decision to hold the session in Calcutta be disobeyed ? As regards uniting Muslim opinion, what guarantee was there that such unity would be forthcoming ? If unity was not attainable in spite of honest efforts, a self-respecting community must not shirk disunity on fundamental matters. If Muslims held that religion could not be divorced from politics, then the lead in favour of a boycott of the Commission given by the Jamiat-ul-Ulema at its Peshawar Session and by the Khilafat Conference at Madras should be acceptable to them. How could the Muslim League keep its mouth shut in view of the self-respect of the

community, which demanded a courageous lead ?

The Simon Commission

He did not think that he should give his views on the Simon Commission elaborately, as these had been widely circulated. The President recalled that in 1924, 1925 and 1926, the popular representatives in the Assembly had, by an overwhelming majority, passed resolutions asking for an advancement of the enquiry, but the Government was adamant. Now the Government had given them a commission unasked. The reason was apparent : the Government felt convinced that unity between the two communities was least likely at this juncture and that, therefore, the time to appoint a Commission had come. Indians had been excluded because they would not have agreed on a common report. Was there any basis for his fear ? There was the case of the Skeen Committee which dealt with the most delicate problem of the country's defence. Not only were all the Indian members unanimous in their recommendation, Mr. Jinnah made the European President also sign the unanimous report. Mr. Jinnah had conducted the cross-examination in London so brilliantly that the Government had decided not to risk a similar performance and a unanimous report. Moulvi Yakub declared that he was not a non-co-operator, but had always been a co-operator; and it was as a co-operator that he would urge the Muslims to co-operate with the Government in the manner the Government had co-operated with them. Thus, as the Government did not want their co-operation on the Commission, so they would withhold their co-operation and would not go near the Commission. His religion did not teach one to turn the other cheek, but to retaliate judiciously.

Hindu-Muslim Differences

Turning to Hindu-Muslim quarrels, he did not wish to apportion blame; but the Prophet had left an example for their guidance when he came to a settlement with the Jews of Medina in a spirit of give and take This spirit of give and

take should now regulate the conduct of Indian Muslims. Unity would not mean the absorption of one community by another. Indians should, like in the Hindu joint-family system, work out their differences within the home, and divide the property between themselves. Such an action would win them the respect of the outside world; but if they took to litigation and to decisions by a third party, the world would condemn them for casting a blot on the fair name of their ancestors.

The Madras Congress settlement would be acceptable to 90 per cent of the enlightened and educated Musalmans. The League should consider this settlement, and declare its opinion on it, showing where it was acceptable and where they wanted it to be modified. They had been challenged to produce a Constitution, and had been taunted that if they were sincere in their declaration in favour of *Swaraj*, they should produce a joint agreement. This challenge had to be accepted, and the Congress settlement should be examined and passed with whatever changes were deemed desirable; for, after all, it was not unchangeable like the laws of the Medes and the Persians. When an agreement was reached on the settlement, it would be entrusted to a special committee of Hindus and Muslims to draw up a Constitution on the basis of the settlement. Thereafter a special meeting of the League could be summoned to ratify the *Swaraj* scheme.

The Need for Muslim Newspapers

Moulvi Yakub felt that the Muslim community was left at a disadvantage by not having a single daily newspaper in India, while the Hindus and other communities had a large number of daily papers in every major town. To fight political battles without a newspaper was like going to war without weapons. If they could not even establish newspaper how could they demand *Swaraj*? The Maharaja of Mahmudabad's efforts in this direction should be supported by every Muslim—indeed, this was their primary duty.

Conclusion

The President then declared that the country was faced by an intense storm. The League's vessel was being steered through troubled waters. He would try to pilot it safely, but for success he would need the fullest assistance of the crew.

He warmly thanked Mrs. Annie Besant and Mrs. Sarojini Naidu for attending the Session. The ninety-year old Annie Besant was younger than their young men; could the 7 crores of Muslims not emulate the strength of this 90-year-old lady ? He expressed particular gratitude to Mrs. Naidu for the efforts she had made to achieve the Madras unity settlement.

3

CALL FOR IMMEDIATE REFORMS*

I am sincerely convinced, he said, "that in the existing political conditions in this country, joint electorates, whether with or without reserved seats, would be certain to furnish a periodical cause of friction between the two communities, and would, in consequence, be in the highest degree injurious to the cause of Indian nationalism." Ridiculing the suggestion that separate electorates had been the cause of inter-communal friction, Sir Muhammad Shafi pointed out that separate communal electorates were first introduced as a result of the Minto-Morley Reforms, and for a period of years after their introduction, the two great communities had lived in an atmosphere of mutual co-operation and goodwill. One of the basic principles of the modern system of democratic government was that the legislature should be really representative of the people. The system of electorates in India must, therefore, be so framed as to give the fullest scope to the real representation of the population, including the Adi-Hindus and labour.

Referring to the Simon Commission, he said that what concerned the Muslim community was the provision in the Reforms Scheme of 1921 that the present Commission was to consider the working of the franchise and the constitution of electorates, including the important matter of retention of communal representation. He, therefore, requested all to

*An indirect version of the Presidential address delivered by Sir Muhammad Shafi (Shafi Group) at the Lahore Session held on 31 December, 1927—1 January, 1928.

settle their political differences, and then present a united Indian demand regarding the next step in the Constitutional advance. A unanimous demand thus made would be irresistible, no matter what the constitution of the Royal Commission might be.

The Muslim League, therefore, should call upon the sister communities to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of inter-communal political controversies, and to prepare a scheme of constitutional reforms which, while satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the Indian political intelligentsia, would, at the same time, ensure that the Muslim community and other minorities in India enjoy their just rights and the satisfaction of their reasonable aspirations.

He urged the appointment of a committee to collaborate with the committees appointed by other organisations to evolve a satisfactory scheme and to bring about unanimity of public opinion.

Sir Muhammad Shafi demanded the introduction of constitutional and administrative reforms in the North-West Frontier Province and the separation of Sind from the Bombay Presidency. The speaker discussed the future reforms, and said that the existing control of the Secretary of State in departments dealing with internal affairs was not conducive to the best interests of administration. He suggested that the Government of India be relieved of the irksome chains with which they were bound in this respect.

Detailing his suggestions for immediate reforms in the central and provincial machineries, he urged, *inter alia,* that the Foreign and Political Department be placed in charge of one member; that an additional civilian member for the Army be appointed to take his place within the Indian Cabinet; and that membership of the Viceroy's Executive Council be increased to eight four of whom should be Indians. He also felt that, in the Central Government, the member or members in

charge of Transferred Subjects should be selected from among the elected representatives of the people in the Central Legislature and should be made responsible to it for their administration. As for diarchy in the provinces, Sir Muhammad Shafi remarked that this interesting experiment should now be abandoned, and one should revert to the principle of unitary provincial governments.

He then dwelt on the question of the legality of the meetings of the Council of the All-India Muslim League held at Delhi on November 20 and December 11, respectively. He said he was elected President of the League by both the Council meetings, and the Punjab Muslim League duly approved of his election. The Council of the All-India Muslim League thus became *functus officio*. As far as the questions of venue and presidentship of the annual meeting were concerned, it was obvious that where the validity of a decision depended on the agreement of two parties, no one of them had any power to set it aside after the necessary agreement by the two had been arrived at. Dr. Kitchlew's pretence for calling the meeting of December 11 was Sir Muhammad Shafi's statement to the press that he would relinquish the presidentship in favour of the Aga Khan, should the latter be willing to support separate Muslim electorates.

That, said Sir Muhammad Shafi, was obviously a matter between the Aga Khan and himself; and until he had finally tendered his resignation of the presidentship, there was no occasion for calling another meeting of the Council to decide what had already been finally settled on November 20. Therefore, the meeting held on December 11 was entirely illegal; and he did not know under what rule and authority Maulvi Mohammad Yakub was elected President of the Calcutta Session of the League, held the day before. This election took place without even sending any intimation to members of the Council of the All-India Muslim League, who were in Lahore. Therefore, said Sir Muhammad Shafi, he, as the truly elected President of the All-India Muslim League, declared the meeting in Calcutta to be illegal.

4

A CARDINAL PRINCIPLE FOR COMMUNAL ADJUSTMENTS*

Gentlemen, an annual session of the All-India Muslim League was never held, in the last two decades, under conditions of greater possibilities than to-day. The air is thick with expressions of views from all quarters. Differences of opinion there are and there will be; but no school of thought desires to stand still. The differences relate to the degrees of changes only. In the circumstances, our business in the present Session is to decide and decide wisely as to what these changes should be. I invite you to concentrate your attention on this and bring to bear upon it your best endeavour to put before the country a policy which may be acceptable, not only to yourselves, but to the whole of India.

Before proceeding to an examination of the subjects before us I desire to refer to the great loss our community has suffered in the demise of the late Right Hon'ble Syed Ameer Ali. Whatever his political views might have been, no Indian could deny that his was a towering personality, and that he ranked amongst the giants of India's sons. His deep learning, his marvellous literary ability, his burning patriotism, and his fervent devotion to the Islamic cause leave behind imperishable memories. We mourn him to-day, but his example of a life of great usefulness and service remains a living force.

[The President also expressed his condolence and sympathy at the death of Lala Lajpat Rai, and said that his death at the

---

*Presidential address delivered by the Raja of Mahmudabad at the Calcutta Session held on 26—30 December, 1928.

present political crisis of the country was an irreparable loss]. He then continued as follows :

Gentlemen, I do not propose to enter into a minute examination of the various views that have been advanced touching the changes that should take place in the system of the government of our land. I will content myself with some of the cardinal principles. To my mind these stand out under three heads. There is a party that demands 'Independence', that is to say, the severance of the British connection. Then there is a larger group that pins its faith on Dominion Status within the British Commonwealth. The third issue is a question of supreme moment that materially affects the realization of either of the two political concepts mentioned above. I mean the conflict of communal basis (*sic*) and prejudice. I refrain from using the expression 'communal interests' advisedly, for I do not believe that there is any real and genuine interest of any community, be it a minority or a majority, that is not a national interest. No national aspiration is worth the name if it disregards the interests of any community in our vast country. All castes, creeds and communities have to pool their resources together, not only to ask for the introduction of *Swaraj*, but, what is more important, to deserve it. For a sane and sensible Indian politician, it is impossible to visualize an Indian democracy which has the taint of sectarianism; and for the majority—because it has the weight and power of a majority—to descend to the lower level of dominating a minority is a negation of the principles of equal citizenship, which is after all the very essence of democratic rule. The apprehensions and misgivings of a minority are not unnatural; and it is an obligation cast upon the majority to remove such doubts and fears. No less, on the other hand, is it incumbent on a minority not to formulate terms that are excessive and unreasonable, trenched behind a communalism which is short-sighted enough to block reforms in which it would itself be a participant. At no time in the history of India, was there a call for unity more insistent than there is now. The solution lies in sweet reasonableness practised by

the majority and the minority alike; both have to make some scrifices and have to be mutually generous. A common national mentality is not attainable on any other basis. I commend this solution to your consideration before I deal with the three subjects in their proper sequence.

As to 'independence', all I have to tell you is that political theories, however idealistic, yield no beneficial results when divorced from actualities. The application of the doctrine of independence, in the sense of severing the British connection, is, to my mind, a hopelessly unworkable proposition. India's place in the British Commonwealth is a place of undeniable security. Her association with the British Commonwealth is a valuable asset, and in my judgment, it would be a folly to destroy this precious commodity with our own hands. It is my conviction that there is plenty of room for the growth, development and expression of Indian nationalism within the ambit of India's connection with England. To my mind, to raise the cry of independence for the country without examining its implication is not statesmanship. Indian nationalism is yet nascent; and it should not be forgotten that there must be laborious decades before it to reach a sturdy manhood. Can it be said that India has reached the stage when her existence will not be imperilled by isolation ? Stern realities cannot be ignored. Classes and communities claiming advantages for themselves do not present a picture of political perfection. Who can deny that the air of our country is not rent by jarring claims ? Can independence be preached by people who have not yet learned to think in terms of true nationalism ? What sort of Constitution is to be planned on the basis of independence for people who have not yet learned even the first lesson in the art and practice of national defence ? Apart from ethical and legal and technical ties, to my mind, the cry of independence is a cry in the wilderness; and I would implore you to enter your emphatic protest against such a suicidal proposal in the present circumstances of India.

There is yet an additional reason for brushing aside the

suggestion of 'Independence'. It lies in the fact that Dominion Status as contained and defined in the Nehru Report, gives us all the rights of citizenship, all the incidence of undiluted democracy, and all the requisites of political freedom that 'Independence' could confer. Adult suffrage, Central and Provincial Governments responsible to the Legislatures, with free and full control of the departments of national defence, foreign affairs, and of relations with Indian States, guarantee·ing the latter all privileges and dignities, are in all conscience sufficient foundation for building up a free Commonwealth of India. If these conditions of Dominion Status are obtained, it is incomprehensible why the vexed question of 'Independence' should be raised at all. In this connection, it has to be remembered that the Nehru Report lays great emphasis on adopting its scheme for the Constitution in its entirety. If the scheme is cut and clipped it will definitely be open to all who subscribe to it to refuse to accept its mutilation, and to treat the disfiguration as a rejection of the national demand. I invite you, gentlemen, to give your whole-hearted support to the Dominion Status insisted upon in the Nehru Report.

As regards the adjustment of differences between community and community, I venture to commend one cardinal principle to you for your consideration. Approach the subject in the spirit of broad-mindedness. As for as I can see, the differences between the Muslim minority and the Hindu majority have narrowed themselves down to issues that are few and not essentials of any first principles. Reservation of seats in proportion to population in provinces where the Muslim is in the majority; whether the Constitution should be unitary or federal; the proportion of reservation in the Central Legislature are all points that are capable of settlement by friendly negotiation. The door for this is open in the Convention that is holding its sittings here in Calcutta. You can send your plenipotentiaries with power to conclude terms with the Convention. There will be a sitting to-morrow; and you should proceed to elect your plenipotentiaries to-day, so that no time

may be lost, and you may make your great contribution to evolving and shaping a Constitution for the free Commonwealth of India that is acceptable to all political parties. Go forth, I beg of you, not in the spirit of stiff-necked bargaining, but in the spirit of compromise and comradeship. Should you be pleased to appoint your plenipotentiaries, let me wish them godspeed and strength to come to an agreement, and thus uphold the honour of Islam and India.

5

IDEA OF A MUSLIM STATE

Gentlemen, I am deeply grateful to you for the honour you have conferred upon me in inviting me to preside over the deliberations of the All-India Muslim League at one of the most critical moments in the history of Muslim political thought and activity in India. I have no doubt that in this great assembly there are men whose political experience is far more extensive than mine, and for whose knowledge of affairs I have the highest respect. It will, therefore, be presumptuous on my part to claim to guide an assembly of such men in the political decisions which they are called upon to make to-day. I lead no party; I follow no leader. I have given the best part of my life to a careful study of Islam, its law and polity, its culture, its history and its literature. This constant contact with the spirit of Islam, as it unfolds itself in time, has, I think given me a kind of insight into its significance as a world fact. It is in the light of this insight, whatever its value, that while assuming that the Muslims of India are determined to remain true to the spirit of Islam, I propose, not to guide you in your decision, but to attempt the humbler task of bringing clearly to your consciousness the main principle which, in my opinion, should determine the general character of these decisions.

Islam and Nationalism

It cannot be denied that Islam, regarded as an ethical ideal plus a certain kind of polity—by which expression I mean a

---

*Presidential address delivered by Sir Muhammad Iqbal at the Allahabad Session held on 29—30 December, 1930.

social structure regulated by a legal system and animated by a specific ethical ideal—has been the chief formative factor in the life-history of the Muslims of India. It has furnished those basic emotions and loyalties which gradually unify scattered individuals and groups, and finally transform them into a well-defined people, possessing a moral consciousness of their own. Indeed it is no exaggeration to say that India is perhaps the only country in the world where Islam, as a people-building force, has worked at its best. In India, as elsewhere, the structure of Islam as a society is almost entirely due to the working of Islam as a culture inspired by a specific ethical ideal. What I mean to say is that Muslim society, with its remarkable homogeneity and inner unity, has grown to be what it is, under the pressure of the laws and institutions associated with the culture of Islam. The ideas set free by European political thinking, however, are now rapidly changing the outlook of the present generation of Muslims, both in India and outside India. Our younger men, inspired by these ideas, are anxious to see them as living forces in their own countries, without any critical appreciation of the facts which have determined their evolution in Europe. In Europe, Christianity was understood to be a purely monastic order which gradually developed into a vast church-organization. The protest of Luther was directed against the church-organization, not against any system of polity of a secular nature, for the obvious reason that there was no such polity associated with Christianity. And Luther was perfectly justified in rising in revolt against this organization; though, I think, he did not realize that, in the peculiar condition which obtained in Europe, his revolt would eventually mean the complete displacement of the universal ethics of Jesus by the growth of a plurality of national and hence narrower systems of ethics. Thus, the upshot of the intellectual movement initiated by such men as Rousseau and Luther was the break-up of the one into a mutually ill-adjusted many, the transformation of a human into a national outlook, requiring a more realistic foundation, such as the notion of country, and finding expres-

sion through varying systems of polity evolved on national lines, i.e. on lines which recognize territory as the only principle of political solidarity. If you begin with the conception of religion as complete other-worldliness, then what has happened to Christianity in Europe is perfectly natural. The universal ethics of Jesus is displaced by national systems of ethics and polity. The conclusion to which Europe is consequently driven is that religion is a private affair of the individual and has nothing to do with what is called man's temporal life.

Islam does not bifurcate the unity of man into an irreconcilable duality of spirit and matter. In Islam God and the universe, spirit and matter, church and state, are organic to each other. Man is not the citizen of a profane world to be renounced in the interest of a world of spirit situated elsewhere. To Islam matter is spirit realizing itself in space and time.

Europe uncritically accepted the duality of spirit and matter probably from Mannichaean thought. Her best thinkers are realizing this initial mistake to-day, but her statesmen are indirectly forcing the world to accept it as an unquestionable dogma. It is, then, this mistaken separation of spiritual and temporal which has largely influenced European religious and political thought, and has resulted practically in the total exclusion of Christianity from the life of European States. The result is a set of mutually ill-adjusted States dominated by interests, not human but national. And these mutually ill-adjusted States, after trampling over the moral and religious convictions of Christianity, are to-day feeling the need of a federated Europe, i.e., the need of a unity which the Christian church-organization originally gave them, but which, instead of reconstructing in the light of Christ's vision of human brotherhood, they considered it fit to destroy under the inspiration of Luther.

A Luther in the world of Islam, however, is an impossible

phenomenon; for here there is no Church-organization, similar to that of Christianity in the Middle Ages, inviting a destroyer. In the world of Islam, we have a universal polity whose fundamentals are believed to have been revealed, but whose structure, owing to our theolegists' want of contact with the modern world, to-day stands in need of renewed power by adjustments. I do not know what will be the final fate of the national idea in the world of Islam. Whether Islam will assimilate and transform it, as it has before assimilated and transformed many ideas expressive of a different spirit, or allow a radical transformation of its own structure by the force of this idea, is hard to predict. Professor Wensinck of Leiden (Holland) wrote to me the other day : "It seems to me that Islam is entering upon a crisis through which Christianity has been passing for more than a century. The great difficulty is how to save the foundations of religion when many antiquated notions have to be given up. It seems to me scarcely possible to state what the outcome will be for Christianity, still less what it will be for Islam." At the present moment, the national idea is racializing the outlook of Muslims, and this is materially counteracting the humanizing work of Islam. And the growth of racial consciousness may mean the growth of standards different and even opposed to the standards of Islam.

I hope you will pardon me for this apparently academic discussion. To address this Session of the All-India Muslim League, you have selected a man who is not despired of Islam as a living force for freeing the outlook of man from its geographical limitations, who believes that religion is a power of the utmost importance in the life of individuals as well as of states, and finally, who believes that *Islam is itself Destiny and will not suffer a destiny* ! Such a man cannot but look at matters from his own point of view. Do not think that the problem I am indicating is a purely theoretical one. It is a very living and practical problem calculated to affect the very fabric of Islam as a system of life and conduct. On a proper solution of it alone depends your future as a distinct cultural

unit in India. Never in our history has Islam had to stand a greater trial than the one which confronts it to-day. It is open to a people to modify, reinterpret or reject the foundational principles of their social structure; but it is absolutely necessary for them to see clearly what they are doing before they undertake to try a fresh experiment. Nor should the way in which I am approaching this important problem lead anybody to think that I intend to quarrel with those who happen to think differently. You are a Muslim assembly, and, I suppose, anxious to remain true to the spirit and ideals of Islam. My sole desire, therefore, is to tell you frankly what I honestly believe to be the truth about the present situation. In this way alone is it possible for me to illuminate, according to my light, the avenues of your political action.

Unity Through Harmony of Differences

What, then, is the problem and its implications ? Is religion a private affair ? Would you like to see Islam, as a moral and political ideal, meeting the same fate in the world of Islam as Christianity has already met in Europe ? Is it possible to retain Islam as an ethical ideal and to reject it as a polity, in favour of national polities in which the religious attitude is not permitted to play any part ? This question becomes of special importance in India where the Muslims happen to be in a minority. The proposition that religion is a private individual experience is not surprising on the lips of a European. In Europe, the conception of Christianity as a monastic order, renouncing the world of matter and fixing its gaze entirely on the world of spirit, led, by a logical process of thought, to the view embodied in this proposition. The nature of the Prophet's religious experience, as disclosed in the Quran, however, is wholly different. It is not mere experience in the sense of a purely biological event, happening inside the experiment and necessitating no reactions on its social environment. It is individual experience creative of a social order. Its immediate outcome is the fundamentals of a polity with implicit legal concepts whose civic significance cannot be belittled merely

because their origin is revelational. The religious ideal of Islam, therefore, is organically related to the social order which it has created. The rejection of the one will eventually involve the rejection of the other. Therefore the construction of a polity on national lines, if it means a displacement of the Islamic principle of solidarity, is simply unthinkable to a Muslim. This is a matter which, at the present moment, directly concerns the Muslims of India. "Man", says Renan, "is enslaved neither by his race, nor by his religion, nor by the course of rivers, nor by the direction of mountain ranges. A great aggregation of men, sane of mind and warm of heart, creates a moral consciousness which is called a nation." Such a formation is quite possible, though it involves the long and arduous process of practically remaking men and furnishing them with a fresh emotional equipment. It might have been a fact in India, if the teaching of Kabir and the 'Divine Faith' of Akbar had seized the imagination of the masses of this country. Experience, however, shows that the various caste units and religious units in India have shown no inclination to sink their respective individualities in a larger whole. Each group is intensely jealous of the collective existence. The formation of the kind of moral consciousness which constitutes the essence of a nation in Renan's sense demands a price which the peoples of India are not prepared to pay. The unity of an Indian nation, therefore, must be sought, not in the negation, but in the mutual harmony and co-operation of the many. True statesmanship cannot ignore facts, however unpleasant they may be. The only practical course is not to assume the existence of a state of things which does not exist, but to recognize facts as they are, and to exploit them to our greatest advantage. And it is on the discovery of Indian unity in this direction that the fate of India as well as of Asia really depends. India is Asia in miniature. Part of her people have cultural affinities with nations in the East, and part with nations in the middle and west of Asia. If an effective principle of co-operation is discovered in India, it will bring peace and mutual goodwill to this ancient land which has suffered so long, more because of her situation in historic space than be-

cause of any inherent incapacity of her people. And it will at the same time solve the entire political problem of Asia.

It is, however, painful to observe that our attempts to discover such a principle of internal harmony have so far failed. Why have they failed? Perhaps, we suspect each other's intentions, and inwardly aim at dominating each other. Perhaps, in the higher interests of mutual co-operation, we cannot afford to part with the monopolies which circumstances have placed in our hands, and conceal our egoism under the cloak of a nationalism, outwardly simulating a large-hearted patriotism, but inwardly as narrow-minded as a caste or tribe. Perhaps, we are unwilling to recognize that each group has a right to free development according to its own cultural traditions. But whatever may be the causes of our failure, I still feel hopeful. Events seem to be tending in the direction of some sort of internal harmony. And as far as I have been able to read the Muslim mind, I have no hesitation in declaring that, if the principle that the Indian Muslim is entitled to full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian homelands, is recognized as the basis of a permanent communal settlement, he will be ready to stake his all for the freedom of India. The principle that each group is entitled to free development on its own lines is not inspired by any feeling of narrow communalism. There are communalisms and communalisms. A community which is inspired by a feeling of ill-will towards other communities is low and ignoble. I entertain the highest respect for the customs, laws, religious and social institutions of other communities. Nay, it is my duty, according to the teaching of the Quran, even to defend their places of worship if need be. *Yet I love the communal group which is the source of my life and behaviour; and which has formed me what I am by giving me its religion, its literature, its thought, its culture, and thereby recreating its whole past, as a living operative factor, in my present consciousness.* Even the authors of the Nehru Report recognize the value of this higher aspect of communalism. While discussing the separation of Sind, they say:

"To say from the view-point of nationalism that no communal provinces should be created is, in a way, equivalent to saying from the still wider international view-point that there should be no separate nations. Both these statements have a measure of truth in them. But the staunchest internationalist recognizes that without the fullest national autonomy, it is extraordinarily difficult to create the international State. *So also, without the fullest cultural autonomy – and communalism in its better aspect is culture – it will be difficult to create a harmonious nation.*"

Muslim India Within India

Communalism, in its higher aspect, then, is indispensable to the formation of a harmonious whole in a country like India. The units of Indian society are not territorial as in European countries. India is a continent of human groups belonging to different races, speaking different languages, and professing different religions. Their behaviour is not at all determined by a common race-consciousness. Even the Hindus do not form a homogeneous group. The principle of European democracy cannot be applied to India without recognizing the fact of communal groups. The Muslim demand for the creation of a Muslim India within India is, therefore, perfectly justified. The resolution of the All-Parties Muslim Conference at Delhi is to my mind wholly inspired by this noble ideal of a harmonious whole which, instead of stifling the respective individualities of its component wholes, affords them chances of fully working out the possiblities that may be latent in them. And I have no doubt that this House will emphatically endorse the Muslim demand embodied in this resolution.

Personally, I would go further than the demands embodied in it. *I would like to see the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single State. Self-government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the*

Muslims, at least of North-West India. The proposal was put forward before the Nehru Committee. They rejected it on the ground that, if carried into effect, it would give a very unwieldy State. This is true in so far as the area is concerned; in point of population, the State contemplated by the proposal would be much smaller than some of the present Indian provinces. The exclusion of Ambala Division, and perhaps of some districts where non-Muslims predominate, will make it less extensive and more Muslim in population...so that the exclusion suggested will enable this consolidated State to give a more effective protection to non-Muslim minorities within its area. The idea need not alarm the Hindus or the British. India is the greatest Muslim country in the world. The life of Islam as a cultural force in this living country very largely depends on its centralization in a specified territory. This centralization of the most living portion of the Muslims of India, whose military and police service has, notwithstanding unfair treatment from the British, made the British rule possible in this country, will eventually solve the problem of India as well as of Asia. It will intensify their sense of responsibility and deepen their patriotic feeling. Thus, possessing full opportunity of development within the body-politic of India, the North-West Indian Muslims will prove the best defenders of India against a foreign invasion, be that invasion one of ideas or of bayonets. The Punjab with a 56 per cent Muslim population supplies 54 per cent of total combatant troops in the Indian army; and if the 19,000 Gurkhas recruited from the independent State of Nepal are excluded, the Punjab contingent amounts to 62 per cent of the whole Indian Army This percentage does not take into account nearly 6,000 combatants supplied to the Indian Army by the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan. From this, you can easily calculate the possibilities of North-West Indian Muslims in regard to the defence of India against foreign aggression. The Right Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri thinks that the Muslim demand for the creation of autonomous Muslim States along the North-West border is actuated by a desire "to acquire

means of exerting pressure in emergencies on the Government of India". I may frankly tell him that the Muslim demand is not actuated by the kind of motive he imputes to us; it is actuated by a genuine desire for free development, which is practically impossible under the type of unitary government contemplated by the nationalist Hindu politicians with a view to securing permanent communal dominance in the whole of India.

Nor should the Hindus fear that the creation of autonomous Muslim States will mean the introduction of a kind of religious rule in such States. I have already indicated to you the meaning of the word religion, as applied to Islam. The truth is that Islam is not a church. It is a State, conceived as a contractual organism long, long before Rousseau ever thought of such a thing, and animated by an ethical ideal which regards man not as an earth-rooted creature, defined by this or that portion of the earth, but as a spiritual being understood in terms of a social mechanism, and possessing rights and duties as a living factor in that mechanism. The character of a Muslim State can be judged from what *The Times of India* pointed out some time ago in a leader on the Indian Banking Inquiry Committee. "In ancient India", the paper points out, "the State framed laws regulating the rates of interests; but in Muslim times, although Islam clearly forbids the realization of interest on money loaned, Indian Muslim States imposed no restrictions on such rates." I therefore demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim State in the best interests of India and Islam. For India, it means security and peace resulting from an internal balance of power; for Islam, an opportunity to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian Imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilize its laws, its education, its culture, and to bring them into closer contact with its own original spirit and with the spirit of modern times.

Federal States

Thus it is clear that, in view of India's infinite variety in

climates, races, languages, creeds and social systems, the creation of autonomous States based on the unity of language, race, history, religion and identity of economic interests, is the only possible way to secure a stable constitutional structure in India. The conception of federation underlying the Simon Report necessitates the abolition of the Central Legislative Assembly as a popular Assembly and makes it an Assembly of the representatives of Federal States. It further demands a redistribution of territory on the lines which I have indicated. And the Report does recommend both. I give my whole-hearted support to this view of the matter; but I venture to suggest that the redistribution recommended in the Simon Report must fulfil two conditions. It must precede the introduction of the new constitution, and it must be so devised as to finally solve the communal problem. Proper redistribution will make the question of joint and separate electorates automatically disappear from the constitutional controversy of India. It is the present structure of the provinces that is largely responsible for this controversy. The Hindu thinks that separate electorates are contrary to the spirit of true nationalism, because he understands the word 'nation' to mean a kind of universal amalgamation in which no communal entity ought to retain its private individuality. Such a state of things, however, does not exist. Nor is it desirable that it should exist. India is a land of racial and religious variety. Add to this the general economic inferiority of the Muslims, their enormous debt, especially in the Punjab, and their insufficient majorities in some of the provinces, as at present constituted, and you will begin to see clearly the meaning of our anxiety to retain separate electorates. In such a country and in such circumstances, territorial electorates cannot secure adequate representation of all interests, and must inevitably lead to the creation of an oligarchy. The Muslims of India can have no objection to purely territorial electorates if provinces are demarcated so as to secure comparatively homogeneous communities, possessing linguistic, racial, cultural and religious unity.

The Simon Report Conception of Federation

But in so far as the question of the powers of the Central Federal State is concerned, there is a subtle difference of motive in the Constitutions proposed by the 'Pandits of India and the Pandits of England. The Pandits of India do not disturb the central authority as it stands at present. All that they desire is that this authority should become fully responsible to the Central Legislature which they maintain intact, and where their majority will become further reinforced on the nominated element ceasing to exist. The Pandits of England, on the other hand, realizing that democracy in the Centre tends to work contrary to their interests and is likely to absorb the whole power now in their hands, in case a further advance is made towards responsible government, have shifted the experiment of democracy from the Centre to the provinces. No doubt, they introduce the principle of federation and appear to have made a beginning by making certain proposals, yet their evaluation of this principle is determined by considerations wholly different from those which determine its value in the eyes of Muslim India. The Muslims demand federation because it is pre-eminently a solution of India's most difficult problem, i.e. the communal problem. The Royal Commissioner's view of federation, though sound in principle, does not seem to aim at responsible government for Federal States. Indeed, it does not go beyond providing means of escape from the situation which the introduction of democracy in India has created for the British, and wholly disregards the communal problem by leaving it where it was.

Thus it is clear that, in so far as real federation is concerned. the Simon Report virtually negatives the principle of federation in its true significance. The Nehru Report, realizing a Hindu majority in the Central Assembly, reaches for a unitary form of government, because such an institution secures Hindu dominance throughout India; the Simon Report retains the present British dominance behind the thin veneer of an unreal federation, partly because the British are naturally

unwilling to part with the power they have so long wielded, and partly because it is possible for them, in the absence of an inter-communal understanding in India, to make out a plausible case for the retention of that power in their own hands. To my mind a unitary form of government is simply unthinkable in a self-governing India. What is called 'residuary powers' must be left entirely to self-governing States, the Central Federal State exercising only those powers which are expressly vested in it by the free consent of Federal States. I would never advise the Muslims of India to agree to a system, whether of British or of Indian origin, which virtually negatives the principle of true federation, or fails to recognize them as a distinct political entity.

The Round-Table Discusion of Federation

The necessity for a structural change in the Central Government was probably seen long before the British discovered the most effective means for introducing this change. That is why, at a rather late stage, it was announced that the participation of the Indian Princes in the Round-Table Conference was essential. It was a kind of surprise to the people of India, particularly the minorities, to see the Indian Princes at the Round-Table Conference dramatically expressing their willingness to join an All-India Federation, and, as a result of their declaration, the Hindu delegates – uncompromising advocates of a unitary form of Government – quietly agreeing to the evolution of a federal scheme. Even Mr. Shastri, who, only a few days before, had severely criticised Sir John Simon for recommending a federal scheme for India, suddenly became a convert and admitted his conversion in the plenary session of the Conference – thus offering the Prime Minister of England an occasion for one of his wittiest observations in his concluding speech. All th's has meaning both for the British, who have sought the participation of the Indian Princes, and the Hindus, who have unhesitatingly accepted the evolution of an All-India Federation. The truth is that the participation of the Indian Princes – among whom only a few are Muslims – in

a federation scheme serves a double purpose. On the one hand, it serves as an all-important factor in maintaining the British power in India practically as it is, on the other hand, it gives an overwhelming majority to the Hindus in. an All-India Federal Assembly.

It appears to me that the Hindu-Muslim differences regarding the ultimate form of the Central Government are being cleverly exploited by British politicians through the agency of the Princes, who see in the scheme prospects of better security for their despotic rule. If the Muslims silently agree to any such scheme, it will simply hasten their end as a political entity in India. The policy of the Indian Federation thus created will be practically controlled by Hindu-Princes forming the largest group in the Central Federal Assembly. They will always lend their support to the Crown in matters of Imperial concern; and in so far as internal administration of the country is concerned, they will help in maintaining and strengthening the supremacy of the Hindus. In other words, the scheme appears to be aiming at a kind of understanding between Hindu India and British Imperialism - you perpetuate me in India, and in return, I give you a Hindu oligarchy to keep all other Indian communities in perpetual subjection. If, therefore, the British Indian provinces are not transformed into really autonomous State, the Princes' participation in a scheme of Indian federation will be interpreted only as a dexterous move on the part of British politicians to satisfy, without parting with any real power, all parties concerned : Muslims with the word 'federation'; Hindus with a majority in the Centre; and British Imperialists whether Tory or Labourite—with the substance of real power.

The number of Hindu States in India is far greater than of Muslim States; and it remains to be seen how the Muslim demand for 33 per cent seats in the Central Federal Assembly is to be met in a House or Houses constituted of representatives taken from British India as well as from Indian States. I hope the Muslim delegates are fully aware of the implications of the

federal scheme as discussed in the Round-Table Conference. The question of Muslim representation in the proposed All-India Federation has not yet been discussed. "The interim report", says Reuter's summary, "contemplates two chambers in the Federal Legislature—each containing representatives both of British India and the States, the proportion of which will be a matter of subsequent consideration under the heads which have not yet been referred to the Subcommittee." In my opinion, the question of proportion is of the utmost importance, and ought to have considered simultaneously with the main question of the structure of the Assembly.

The best course, I think, would have been to start with a British Indian federation only. A federal scheme born of an unholy union between democracy and despotism cannot but keep British India in the same vicious circle of a unitary Central Government. Such a unitary form may be of the greatest advantage to the British, to the majority community in British India, and to the Indian Princes; it can be of no advantage to the Muslims unless they get majority rights in five out of eleven Indian provinces with full residuary powers, and a one-third share of seats in the total House of the Federal Assembly. In so far as the attainment of sovereign powers by the British Indian Provinces is concerned, the position of H.H. the Ruler of Bhopal, Sir Akbar Hydari and Mr. Jinnah is unassailable. In view, however, of the participation of the Princes in the Indian Federation, we must now see our demand for representation in the British Indian Assembly in a new light. The question is not one of the Muslim share in a British Indian Assembly, but one which relates to representation of British Indian Muslims in an All-India Federal Assembly. Our demand for 33 per cent must now be taken as a demand for the same proportion in the All-India Federal Assembly, exclusive of the share allotted to the Muslim States entering the Federation.

The Problem of Defence

The other difficult problem which confronts the successful working of a Federal system in India is the problem of India's defence. In their discussion of this problem, the Royal Commissioners have marshalled all the deficiencies of India in order to make out a case for Imperial administration of the army. "India and Britain", say the Commissioners, "are so related that India's defence cannot now, or in any future which is within sight, be regarded as a matter of purely Indian concern. The control and direction of such an army must rest in the hands of agents of the Imperial Government. Now, does it necessarily follow from this that further progress towards the realization of responsible government in British India is barred until the work of defence can be adequately discharged without the help of British officers and British troops? As things are, there is a block on the line of constitutional advance. All hopes of evolution in the Central Government towards the ultimate goal described in the declaration of August 20, 1917, are in danger of being indefinitely frustrated if the attitude illustrated by the Nehru Report is maintained, that any future change involves putting the administration of the army under the authority of an elected Indian Legislature." Further, to fortify their argument, they emphasize the fact of competing religious and rival races of widely different capacity, and try to make the problem look insoluble by remarking that "the obvious fact that India is not, in the ordinary and natural sense, a single nation is nowhere made more plain than in considering the difference between the martial races of India and the rest". These features of the question have been emphasized in order to demonstrate that the British are not only keeping India secure from foreign menance, but are also the 'neutral guardians' of internal security. However, in federated India, as I understand federation, the problem will have only one aspect, i.e., external defence. Apart from provincial armies necessary for maintaining internal peace, the Indian Federal Congress can maintain, on the North-West Frontier, a strong Indian Frontier Army composed of units recruited from all

provinces and officered by efficient and experienced military men taken from all communities. I know that India is not in possession of efficient military officers, and this fact is exploited by the Royal Commissioners in the interest of an argument for Imperial administration. On this point, I cannot but quote another passage from the Report which, to my mind, furnishes the best argument against the position taken up by the Commissioners. "At the present moment," says the Report, "no Indian holding the King's Commission is of higher army rank than a captain. There are, we believe, 39 captains of whom 25 are in ordinary regimental employ. Some of them are of an age which would prevent their attaining much higher rank, even if they passed the necessary examination before retirement. Most of these have not been through Sandhurst, but got their Commissions during the Great War. Now, however genuine may be the desire and however earnest the endeavour to work for the transformation, the overriding conditions so forcibly expressed by the Skeen Committee (whose members, apart from the Chairman and the Army Secretary, were Indian gentlemen), in the words 'Progress...must be contingent upon success being secured at each stage and upon military efficiency being maintained throughout,' must in any case render such development measured and slow. A higher command cannot be evolved at short notice out of existing cadres of Indian officers, all of junior rank and limited experience. Not until the slender trickle of suitable Indian recruits for the officer class—and we earnestly desire an increase in their numbers—flows in much greater volume, not until sufficient Indians have attained the experience and training requisite to provide all the officers for, at any rate, some Indian regiments, not until such units have stood the only test which can possibly determine their efficiency, and not until Indian officers have qualified by a successful army career for high command, will it be possible to develop the policy of Indianization to a point which will bring a completely Indianized army within sight. Even then years must elapse before the process could be completed."

Now I venture to ask who is responsible for the present

state of things? Is it due to some inherent incapacity of our martial races or to the slowness of the process of military training? The military capacity of our martial races is undeniable. The process of military training may be slow as compared to other processes of human training. I am no military expert to judge this matter. But as a layman, I feel that the argument, as stated, assumes the process to be practically endless. This means perpetual bondage for India, and makes it all the more necessary that the Frontier Army, as suggested by the Nehru Report, be entrusted to the charge of a committee of defence the personal of which may be settled by mutual understanding.

Again it is significant that the Simon Report has given extraordinary importance to the question of India's land frontier, but has made only passing reference to its naval position. India has doubtless had to face invasions from her land frontiers; but it is obvious that her present master took possession of her on account of her defenceless sea coast. A self-governing and free India, will, in these days, have to take greater care of her sea coast than her land frontiers.

I have no doubt that if a Federal Government is established, Muslim Federal States will willingly agree, for purposes of India's defence, to the creation of neutral Indian military and naval forces. Such a neutral military force for the defence of India, was a reality in the days of Mughal rule. Indeed, in the time of Akbar, the Indian frontier was, on the whole, defended by armies officered by Hindu generals. I am perfectly sure that the scheme of a neutral Indian army, based on a federated India, will intensify Muslim patriotic feeling, and finally set at rest the suspicion, if any, of Indian Muslims joining Muslims from beyond the frontier in the event of an invasion.

The Alternative

I have thus tried briefly to indicate the way in which the

Muslims of India ought, in my opinion, to look at the two most important constitutional problems of India. A redistribution of British India calculated to secure a permanent solution of the communal problem is the main demand of the Muslims of India. If, however, the Muslim demand for a territorial solution of the communal problem is ignored, then I support, as emphatically as possible, the Muslim demands repeatedly urged by the All-India Muslim League and the All-India Muslim Conference. The Muslims of India cannot agree to any constitutional changes which affect their majority rights, to be secured by separate electorates, in the Punjab and Bengal, or fail to guarantee them 33 per cent representation in any Central Legislature. There were two pitfalls into which Muslim political leaders fell. The first was the repudiated Lucknow Pact, which originated in a false view of Indian nationalism, and deprived the Muslims of India from chances of acquiring any political power in India. The second is the narrow-visioned sacrific-eof Islamic solidarity in the interests of what may be called 'Punjab Ruralism', resulting in a proposal which virtually reduces the Punjab Muslims to the position of a minority. It is the duty of the League to condemn both the Pact and the proposal.

The Simon Report does great injustice to the Muslims in not recommending a statutory majority for the Punjab and Bengal. It would either make the Muslims stick to the Lucknow Pact or agree to a scheme of joint electorates. The Despatch of the Government of India on the Simon Report admits that since the publication of that document, the Muslim community has not expressed its willingness to accept any of the alternatives proposed by the Report. The Despatch recognize that it may be a legitimate grievance to deprive the Muslims in the Punjab and Bengal of representation in the Councils in proportion to their population merely because of weightage allowed to Muslim minorities elsewhere. But the Despatch of the Government of India fails to correct the injustice of the Simon Report. In so far as the Punjab is concer-

ned—and this is the more crucial point—it endorses the so-called 'carefully balanced scheme' worked out by the official members of the Punjab Government, which gives the Punjab Muslims a majority of two over the Hindus and Sikhs combined, and a proportion of 49 per cent of the house as a whole. It is obvious that the Punjab Muslims cannot be satisfied with less than a clear majority in the total house. However, Lord Irwin and his Government do recognize that the justification of communal electorates for majority communities would not cease unless and until, by the extension of franchise, their voting strength more correctly reflects their population; and further, unless a two-third majority of the Muslim members in a Provincial Council unanimously agree to surrender the right of separate representation. I cannot, however, understand why the Government of India, having recognized the legitimacy of the Muslim grievance, have not had the courage to recommend a statutory majority for the Muslims in the Punjab and Bengal.

Nor can the Muslims of India agree to any such changes which fail to create at least Sind as a separate province, and treat the North-West Frontier Province as a province of inferior political status. I see no reason why Sind should not be united with Baluchistan and turned into a separate province. It has nothing in common with the Bombay Presidency. In point of life and civilization, the Royal Commissioners find it more akin to Mesopotamia and Arabia than India. The Muslim geographer Masudi noticed this kinship long ago, when he said, "Sind is a country nearer to the dominions of Islam." The first Omayyad ruler is reported to have said of Egypt: "Egypt has her back towards Africa and her face towards Arabia." With necessary alternations, the same remark describes the exact situation of Sind. She has her back towards India and her face towards Central Asia. Considering further the nature of her agricultural problems, which can invoke no sympathy from the Bombay Government, and her infinite commercial possibilities, dependent on the inevitable growth of Karachi into a second metropolis in India, it is unwise to keep her attracted to a

Presidency which, though friendly to-day, is likely to become a rival at no distant period. Financial difficulties, we are told, stand in the way of separation. I do not know of any definite authoritative pronouncement on the matter. But, assuming there are such difficulties, I see no reason why the Government of India should not give temporary financial help to a promising province in her struggle for independent progress.

As to the North-West Frontier Province, it is painful to note that the Royal Commissioners have practically denied that the people of this province have any right to reform. They fall far short of the Bray Committee, and the Council recommended by them is merely a screen to hide the autocracy of the Chief Commissioner. The inherent right of the Afghan to light a cigarette is curtailed merely because he happens to be living in a powder house. The Royal Commissioners' epigrammatic argument is pleasant enough, but far from convincing. Political reform is light, not fire; and to light, every human being is entitled, whether he happens to live in a powder house or a coal mine. Brave, shrewd and determined to suffer for his legitimate aspirations, the Afghan is sure to resent any attempt to deprive him of opportunities of full self-development. To keep such a people contented is in the best interest of both England and India. What has recently happened in that unfortunate province is the result of a step-motherly treatment shown to the people since the introduction of the principle of self-government in the rest of India. I only hope that British statesmanship will not obscure its view of the situation by hoodwinking itself into the belief that the present unrest of the province is due to any extraneous causes.

The recommendation for the introduction of a measure of reform in the N.W.F.P. made in the Government of India's Despatch is also unsatisfactory. No doubt the despatch goes further than the Simon Report in recommending a sort of representative Council and a semi-representative Cabinet, but it fails to treat this important Muslim province on en equal footing with other

Indian provinces. Indeed, the Afghan is by instinct more fitted for democratic institutions than any other people in India.

The Round-Table Conference

I think I am now called upon to make a few observations on the Round-Table Conference. Personally, I do not feel optimistic as to the results of this Conference. It was hoped that, away from the actual scene of communal strife and in a changed atmosphere, better counsels would prevail, and a genuine settlement of the differences between the two major communities of India would bring India's freedom within sight. Actual events, however, tell a different tale. Indeed, the discussion of the communal question in London has demonstrated, more clearly than ever, the essential disparity between the two great cultural units of India. Yet the Prime Minister of England apparently refuses to see that the problem of India is international. He is reported to have said that "his Government would find it difficult to submit to Parliament proposals for the maintenance of separate electorates, since joint electorates were much more in accordance with British democratic sentiment". Obviously he does not see that the model of British democracy cannot be of any use in a land of many nations; and that a system of separate electorates is only a poor substitute for a territorial solution of the problem. Nor is the Minorities Sub-Committee likely to reach a satisfactory settlement. The whole question will have to go before the British Parliament; and we can only hope that the keen-sighted representatives of the British nation, unlike most of our Indian politicians, will be able to pierce through the surface of things, and clearly see the true fundamentals of peace and security in a country like India. To base a Constitution on the concept of a homogeneous India, or to apply to India principles dictated by British democratic sentiments, is unwittingly to prepare her for a civil war. As far as I can see, there will be no peace in the country until the various peoples that constitute India are given opportunities of free self-development on modern lines, without abruptly breaking with their past.

I am glad to be able to say to that our Muslim delegates fully realize the importance of a proper solution of what I call India's international problem. They are perfectly justified in pressing for a solution of the communal question before the responsibility in the Central Government is finally settled. No Muslim politician should be sensitive to the taunt embodied in that propaganda word 'communalism'—expressly devised to exploit what the Prime Minister calls British democratic sentiments, and to mislead England into assuming a state of things which does not really exist in India. Great interests are at stake. We are 70 millions, and far more homogeneous than any other people in India. Indeed, the Muslims of India are the only Indian people who can fitly be described as a nation in the modern sense of the word. The Hindus, though ahead of us in almost all respects, have not yet been able to achieve the kind of homogeneity which is necessary for a nation, and which Islam has given you as a free gift. No doubt they are anxious to become a nation, but the process of becoming a nation is a kind of travail, and in the case of Hindu India, involves a complete overhauling of her social structure. Nor should the Muslim leaders and politicians allow themselves to be carried away by the subtle but fallacious arguments that Turkey and Persia and other Muslim countries are progressing on national, i.e. territorial, lines. The Muslims of India are differently situated. The countries of Islam outside India are practically wholly Muslim in population. The minorities there belong, in the language of the Quran, to the 'people of the Book'. There are no social barriers between Muslims and 'the people of the Book'.. Indeed the first practical step that Islam took towards the realization of a final combination of humanity was to call upon peoples possessing practically the same ethical ideal to come forward and combine. The Quran declares, "O people of the Book! Come, let us join together on the 'word' (Unity of God) that is common to us all." The wars of Islam and Christianity, and, later, European aggression in its various forms, could not allow the infinite meaning of this verse to work itself out in the world of Islam. To-day, it is being gradually realized in the countries of Islam in the

shape of what is called Muslim Nationalism.

It is hardly necessary for me to add that the sole test of the success of our delegates is the extent to which they are able to get the non-Muslim delegates of the Conference to agree to our demands as embodied in the Delhi Resolution. If these demands are not agreed to, then a question of a very great and far-reaching importance will arise for the community. Then will arrive the moment for independent and concerted political action by the Muslims of India. If you are at all serious about your ideals and aspirations, you must be ready for such action. Our leading men have done a good deal of political thinking, and their thought has certainly made us, more or less, sensitive to the forces which are now shaping the destinies of peoples in India and outside India. But, I ask, has this thinking prepared us for the kind of action demanded by the situation which may arise in the near future? Let me tell you frankly that, at the present moment, the Muslims of India are suffering from two evils. The first is the want of personalities. Sir Malcolm Hailey and Lord Irwin were perfectly correct in their diagnosis, when they told the Aligarh University that the community had failed to produce leaders. By leaders, I mean men who, by Divine gift or experience, possess a keen perception of the spirit and destiny of Islam, along with an equally keen perception of the trend of modern history. Such men are really the driving forces of a people, but they are God's gift and cannot be made to order. The second evil from which the Muslims of India are suffering is that the community is fast losing what is called the herd instinct. This makes it possible for individuals and groups to start independent careers without contributing to the general thought and activity of the community. We are doing to-day in the domain of politics what we have been doing for centuries in the domain of religion. But sectional bickerings in religion do not do much harm to our solidarity. They at least indicate an interest in what makes the sole principle of our structure as a people. Moreover, this principle is so broadly conceived that it is almost impossible for a group to become rebellious to the extent

of wholly detaching itself from the general body of Islam. But diversity in political action, at a moment when concerted action is needed in the best interests of the very life of our people, may prove fatal. How shall we, then, remedy these two evils? The remedy of the first evil is not in our hands. As to the second evil, I think it is possible to discover a remedy. I have got definite views on the subject; but I think it is proper to postpone their expression till the apprehended situation actually arises. In case it does arise, leading Muslims of all shades of opinion will have to meet together, not to pass resolutions, but finally to decide the Muslim attitude and to show the path to tangible achievement. In this address, I mention this alternative only because I wish that you may keep it in mind, and give some serious thought to it in the meantime.

Conclusion

Gentlemen, I have finished. In conclusion, I cannot but impress upon you that the present crisis in the history of India demands complete organization and unity of will and purpose in the Muslim community, both in your own interest as a commnnity, and in the interest of India as a whole. The political bondage of India has been and is a source of infinite misery to the whole of Asia It has suppressed the spirit of the East, and wholly deprived her of that joy of self-expression which once made her the creator of a great and glorious culture. We have a duty towards India where we are destined to live and die. We have a duty towards Asia, especially Muslim Asia. And since seventy millions of Muslims in a single country constitute a far more valuable asset to Islam than all the countries of Muslim Asia put together, we must look at the Indian problem, not only from the Muslim point of view, but also from the standpoint of the Indian Muslim as such. Our duty towards Asia and India cannot be loyally performed without an organized will fixed on a definite purpose. In your own interest, as a political entity among other political entities of India, such an equipment is an absolute necessity. Our disorganized condition has already confused political issues vital to the life of the com-

munity. I am not hopeless of an intercommunal understanding, but I cannot conceal from you the feeling that in the near future our community may be called upon to adopt an independent line of action to cope with the present crisis. And an independent line of political action, in such a crisis, is possible only to a determined people, possessing a will focalized by a single purpose.

Is it possible for you to achieve the organic wholeness of a unified will? Yes, it is. Rise above sectional interests and private ambitions, and learn to determine the value of your individual and collective action, however directed on material ends, in the light of the ideal which you are supposed to represent. Pass from matter to spirit. Matter is diversity; spirit is light, life and unity. One lesson I have learnt from the history of Muslims. At critical moments in their history, it is Islam that has saved Muslims and not *vice versa*. If today you focus your vision on Islam and seek inspiration from the ever-vitalizing idea embodied in it, you will be only reassembling your scattered forces, regaining your lost integrity, and thereby saving yourself from total destruction. One of the profoundest verses in the Holy Quran teaches us that the birth and rebirth of the whole of humanity is like the birth and rebirth of a single individual. Why cannot you, who as a people, can well claim to be the first practical exponents of this superb conception of humanity, live and move and have your being as a single individuals? I do not wish to mystify any body when I say that things in India are nor what they appear to be. The meaning of this, however, will dawn upon you only when you have achieved a real collective ego to look at them. In the words of the Quran, "Hold fast to yourself; no one who erreth can hurt you, provided you are well-guided".

6

CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES AND LEGITIMATE RIGHTS OF MUSLIMS*

In the sphere of political liberty, the ultimate ideal that we have in view is not capable of being defined and confined within the limits of such expressions as 'Dominion Status', 'Responsible Government' or even 'equal partnership'; for circumstances are conceivable under which the interpretation of the terms may be confined to the expression of that relationship alone which the future Government of India may bear to the British Government, and yet leave untouched the essentials of liberty to be provided and secured for every class and section of the people of this country. It is obvious that unless this last condition is fulfilled, freedom from outside control may merely result in greater licence being afforded to those in whose hand political power may vest to encroach upon the rights and liberties of the people of the country or of certain sections of it. To win a Constitution for India which when fully developed would fulfil both the conditions outlined above, the Muslims would be willing, not only to march shoulder to shoulder with other communities, but if need and opportunity arose, even ahead of them.

All-India Federation

Discussing the question of an All-India Federation, he said that, to the general outlines of the Federal Scheme, nobody

---

*An indirect version of the Presidential address delivered by Choudhury Zafarullah Khan at the Delhi Session of Muslim League held on 26-27 December, 1931.

could have any objection. But he drew particular attention to some of the difficulties involved in the application of the Scheme to the actual conditions obtaining in the country. "For instance, certain subjects, notably Defence and Foreign Relations, Treaties with Indian States and their interpretation, etc , are proposed to be classified, for the present, as Crown subjects with regard to which the Governor-General would continue to be responsible to the British Parliament. These subjects will be in charge of Ministers who would be responsible to the Governor-General and not to the Legislature."

Again, Provincial subjects would be committed to the complete control of the respective provinces but Central subjects would be controlled and administered by the Federal Government, which would consist of an Executive and a Legislature drawn both from British India and from Indian States. "This", he said, "is the first difficulty, namely, that the Indian States participating in the Federation would obtain a share in the administration of subjects which are purely British Indian subjects, corresponding subjects in the Indian States being administered by such States within their respective territories without any control being exercised over them by the Federal Government. In other words, the Federation would be composed of units, the autonomy of some of which, namely, the Indian State., would extend over a much larger sphere than that of the remaining units, namely, British Indian Provinces, and in which some of the subjects which are common to one group of units only would be administered by the Federation, that is to say, of all the units put together. The remedy for this state of affairs would be to eliminate completely the category of subjects which I have described above as Central subjects, and this could be done by transferring the greater part of them to provinces and by declaring the balance to be Federal. This would naturally require long persuasion and detailed adjustment; but so long as this result is not arrived at, the Federation would continue to be a lopsided structure.

"Even after careful and exhaustive schedules and lists have been compiled, classifying different subjects as Reserved, Federal, Central and Provincial, the Constitution must contain a provision regarding such unforeseen matters as may arise from time to time, and which may not have been allotted to any of these specific categories of subjects. Such matters are technically known as Residuary matters. Residuary matters and the powers to deal with such matters are known as Residuary Powers. No definite decision has been arrived at by the Conference as to whether such powers shall, under the new Constitution, vest in the Federal Government or in the Governments of the component units of the Federation. The very idea of a Federation such as is proposed by the Conference presupposes, however, that Residuary Powers must necessarily vest in the units of the Federation. Whatever may be the theories on the subject, the actual condition facing us is that the Indian States that may decide to join the Federation are not likely to give their consent to investing the Federal Government with any powers other than those specifically assigned to it; and they have insisted and will insist that, apart from such well-defined powers, all other powers of sovereignty must continue to vest in the rulers or administrations of the respective States. In other words, powers with regard to all subjects that are not specifically declared to be Reserved or Federal Subjects must vest in the units so far as the States are concerned. This must lead to the necessary consequence that as regards British Indian Provinces also, Residuary Powers must vest in the provinces; for if this were not so, we would have the spectacle of a Federation in which Residuary Powers as regards some units would be exercised by those units, and as regards other units, by the Federation as a whole. There is no other Federation in existence in which such a state of affairs exists, and it would be nothing short of an absurdity to permit such a provision to be incorporated in the future Constitution of India."

As regards the method of election or appointment of the members of the Federal Legislature, he said, "Everybody is

agreed that British Indian members must come in by election, although there is some difference of opinion as to whether the members of the Lower Chamber should be elected by the method of direct or indirect election, there being practical unanimity on the point that the members of the Upper Chamber should be elected by Provincial Legislatures. As regards representatives of the Indian States, the States desire that the method of selection of such representatives should be left entirely to the discretion of the States concerned. In other words, the States desire that their representatives to both the Chambers of the Federal Legislature shall be nominated by their rulers or administrations, which obviously means that so far as the Indian States are concerned, the only persons represented in the Federal Legislature will be rulers or administrations of the States that join the Federation. This again is a matter which would place British Indian Provinces in one category, and the Indian States in another. We recognize that the States joining the Federation can legitimately insist upon retaining their full internal autonomy; but we cannot support the position that, whereas the representatives of British India should represent the people of British India, the representatives of the Indian States should represent only the rulers of those States."

All-India Services

After dealing with the problems of the Federal legislature, Federal finance and franchise, Choudhury Zafarullah referred to the All-India Services, and observed: "The only safe course to adopt would be to provincialize all services, the officers of which are normally to serve in provincial departments. It would still be necessary for the provinces, at least for some time to come, to employ a certain number of European officers in different branches of the administration. The recruitment of such officers could be secured by each Province according to its requirement through the Secretary of State for India, whether on a permanent or on a period basis, as may be considered desirable."

Defence of India

Discussing the question of the defence of India, he said: "There can be no question that so long as India is dependent upon the British for its land, naval and aerial defence, it cannot enjoy any form of real and responsible government. The complete and rapid Indianization of the Army in India, therefore, is an urgent and a vital necessity. While in this connection, some attention is being paid to the admission of Indians to his Majesty's Commissions in various arms of the forces in India, enough attention is not being paid to the question of the admission of Indians to the ranks in arms to which their entry has hitherto been barred—for instance, some sections of the artillery, the tank corps, armoured car companies etc. We must be prepared to furnish large numbers of suitable young men for recruitment into all sections of the Army, and urge upon the Government the necessity of making proper arrangements for their training. There is also the very important question of equipment which requires careful consideration. The manufacture of arms, machine guns, cannons, tanks, armoured cars, ammunition of various kinds, etc., within India is a problem which has not yet been brought under consideration; and yet the vital necessity of tackling and solving this question is more than apparent For the adequate naval defence of the country, it is not sufficient merely to provide for the training of a handful of young men as marine and naval officers: adequate provision must be made for the training of a sufficient number of young men in all branches of the navy and, more particularly, in all branches of marine engineering. For purposes of aerial defence, our young men must be prepared to come forward in large numbers to be trained as pilots, mechanics and ground engineers. The development of civil aviation on a large scale would not only give an impetus to recruitment to the various ranks of the Air Force, but would also provide a reserve of officers, pilots, mechanics, engineers, etc., which could be mobilized in case of necessity.

Gentlemen, you will realize that these are very large

questions, and they deserve your immediate and earnest attention. As I have observed above, a liberty which depends for its maintenance upon the aid and assistance of another nation cannot deserve the name of liberty at all; and if you have a desire both to earn and enjoy the blessings of real liberty, you must be prepared to make the sacrifices that may be required for the achievement of that ideal.

Provincial Autonomy

As regards the Provinces, it is generally agreed that they shall, under the new Constitution, be fully autonomous and responsible, that is to say, they shall be freed from the control of the Central (in future the Federal) Government so far as questions of purely provincial administration are concerned, and that, throughout, the Provincial Executive shall normally be completely responsible to the Provincial Legislature. This is a comparatively simple matter; and subject to the adjustment of communal claims and interests (to which I shall advert at a later stage), it should have been possible to carry it into effect almost immediately. A majority of the British Indian delegates to the Round-Table Conference, however, urged upon the Prime Minister the desirability of postponing any advance in the provinces till such time as the principle of responsibility at the Centre could also be enforced. Those who held this view were of the opinion that the immediate establishment of complete autonomy in the provinces might give rise to a suspicion in the minds of the people that the settlement of questions connected with the Centre would not be proceeded with speedily, and that under certain circumstances, this suspicion may perhaps eventually be proved to have been justified. With great respect to those who hold this opinion, I beg to differ with them. I am one of those who consider that the immediate establishment of complete autonomy in the provinces would both facilitate and accelerate the framing of a scheme for a responsible Federal Government, and that it would be unwise to postpone the next stage of advance in the province till a satisfactory solution of

questions affecting the Centre has been discovered and agreed to.

Constitutional Safeguards

The position which the Muslims hold in this country is both peculiar and unique. It would be difficult to point out a parallel in the contemporary or past history of any other country or community. Our numbers exceed the numbers of many communities which are to-day enjoying and have in the past enjoyed the position and privileges of a nation. Our religious, cultural, social, and I may add, even linguistic unity supplies us with all the essentials that go to form a nation. Our common civilization, traditions, and history furnish additional factors that bind us together. We are anxious to preserve intact all these factors; and past experience has taught us that special provisions and safeguards are necessary for such protection, although we feel that, even with these provisions and safeguards in the Constitution, the protection afforded will not be complete or even adequate. This, however, is a disability to which all political minorities are subject, and it is not capable of being remedied by constitutional safeguards. For this reason, it is all the more imperative that any Constitution that may be framed should contain provisions safeguarding these matters to the fullest limits to which constitutional safeguards can extend. In framing our proposals in this connection, however, we have been careful not to trench upon the legitimate rights of other communities.

Gentlemen, you are all familiar with the scheme of safeguards for Muslim interests which has been repeatedly and unanimously put forward by the leaders and representative bodies commanding the confidence of the community. Some of these safeguards would afford equal protection to all communities; others are based upon considerations which are not primarily of a communal nature; and the balance are designed to secure the protection of matters held dear by the community, or such vital interests as are bound to affect the future pros-

perity and well-being of the community.

Under the first head would fall the demand that the Constitution should contain a clause defining fundamental rights such as freedom of profession, practice and propagation of religion, education, language, articles of food, cultural and social usages, etc. and that it should devise means whereby these matters may be fully safeguarded This is a matter with regard to which there can be no possible difference of opinion and its consideration need, therefore, detain us no longer.

The demands that the North-West Frontier Province should be raised to a status of political equality with the other provinces of India, and that Sind should be separated from Bombay and should be constituted into a Governor's province, under a Constitution similar to that which may be introduced in other provinces, fall under the second category. As regards the first of these demands, the position is that the Prime Minister in his statement of December 1, 1931, has announced that the North-West Frontier Province shall under the new Constitution enjoy a status similar to that of other British Indian provinces, subject only to due requirements for the defence of the Frontier. It is earnestly to be hoped that the operation of this last condition shall be confined within the narrowest possible limits. The Prime Minister has further announced that the provisional decision to postpone further advance in the provinces till the framing of a scheme for the whole of India shall not operate so as to prevent the North-West Frontier Province being immediately raised to the position which is occupied by the other provinces under the present Constitution. We understand that steps are being taken so as to bring about this result; but we must impress upon the Government the necessity of proceeding in the matter with the utmost despatch so that peace may speedily be restored to that Province, where very unhappy and disturbed conditions have unfortunately prevailed during the last two or three years. Let us hope that this consummation, so earnestly to be desired, shall not be delayed on the pretext that lengthy enquiries may be necessary for the

purpose of settling such matters as franchise qualifications for municipal and district board elections and for elections to the Legislative Council of the Province.

As regards the separation of Sind from Bombay, unfortunately no definite announcement has yet been made; and the Prime Minister's statement on the subject made on December 1, 1931, carried the matter no further than the decision taken at the end of the first session of the Round-Table Conference. We insist that the matter of the separation of Sind from Bombay should be placed beyond doubt, and that steps be taken immediately to enable Sind to start as a separate province simultaneously with the introduction of the new Constitution in the other provinces. Under the same category. falls the demand that a suitable scheme should be devised to enable Baluchistan to enjoy a representative form of government.

It has also been agreed that Muslims, as well as other minorities, shall receive a fair and adequate share in the public services of the country. We realize that a general declaration of this kind may not in practice prove a sufficient safeguard; but it at least amounts to a recognition and acceptance of the claims made by the minorities, and should serve as a reminder to those to whom the task of recruitment to the public services of the country may in future be entrusted. It also sets a standard of conformity which may be insisted upon by the minorities. both at the Centre and in the provinces.

As regards the quantum of representation to be allotted to the Muslims in the Federal Legislature, as well as the different provinces, the Muslim position has throughout been perfectly clear. The Muslims demand representation to the extent of one-third in each Chamber of the Federal Legislature, the continuance of the quantum of representation at present enjoyed by them in what are known as the minority provinces—namely, the United Provinces, Bombay, Assam, Bihar and Orissa, Madras and the Central provinces— subject to any subsequent revision of

those proportions where, owing to some cause or the other, the proportion of various communities in the population has undergone a sensible modification, the principle applicable in all cases being the same upon which the present proportions of representation are based. In the Legislatures of the Punjab and Bengal, the Muslims claim representation in accordance with their proportion. On the other hand, in the North-West Frontier Province and Sind the Muslims are willing to concede weightage to the non-Muslim communities on the same principles on which weightage is being enjoyed by the Muslims in their minority provinces.

The difficulty that is being experienced with regard to the representation of Muslims in the Federal Legislature is a part of the general question of the method of election or appointment of the members of the Federal Legislature, and arises in connection with the proportion of Muslim representatives from the Indian States. The suggestion which seemed to have met with the largest amount of support was that 26 per cent of the total strength of each Federal Chamber should be returned by British Indian Muslims, and that 7 per cent of the total strength of each Chamber should be Muslims nominated by the Federating Indian States, in pursuance of a convention which may be agreed to by all parties.

The main dispute centres round the question of the amount of representation to be allotted to Muslims in the Legislatures of the Punjab and Bengal. But before I go on to make some general observations relating to the whole question of the quantum of Muslim representation in the various Legislatures, I must add that the question of the method of electing Muslim representatives is one of equal importance with the question of the amount of representation, and that although there has been a dissentient voice here and there, there can be no doubt that an overwhelming preponderance of Muslim opinion insists upon the retention of the present method of representation through separate electorates. It would be convenient to discuss both these subjects together.

The past experience of Muslims in the country has taught them that, for the protection of their rights and interests, they must insist upon legal and constitutional guarantees, and that a mere trust in the goodwill and sense of fair dealing of other communities would not be of any avail to them in this connection. It is extremely unfortunate that this should be so; but, however desirable it may be that the various communities which form the population of this country learn to trust each other and to respect each other's legitimate rights, aspirations and interests, we must face the situation as we find it. So long as the attitude of the majority community in the country does not undergo such radical changes as to create a sense of complete security and confidence in the minds of the members of the minority communities, the latter must insist upon their rights and interests being safeguarded in a manner and to an extent which appear to them to be suitable and necessary. Viewed from a larger and broader point of view, the Muslim claim is not only reasonable but is extremely modest. The Muslim position is that, given these safeguards, they are willing cheerfully to accept the rule of the majority community in the minority provinces as well as at the Centre. No greater proof of good faith could be required from them. On the other hand, they are naturally anxious that in provinces in which they constitute a majority of the population, they should be given as large an opportunity of making their contribution to the common culture and common civilization of India as would be enjoyed by the majority community in the greater part of the country. They also desire that they should be placed in a position which would afford them equal opportunities of service to the land of their birth.

Another essential feature of the scheme of safeguards for Muslim interests is the demand that the method of election of their representatives through separate electorates, which has had the sanction of statute in this country during the last 10 years, should be continued till such time as the Muslims themselves feel that this safeguard is no longer necessary.

The present situation, however, is that in spite of our best efforts and in spite of the best interests of the country urgently requiring it, the majority community has not so far signified its acceptance of the demands; and the cqurse which the negotiations have followed during recent years convinces us that that community has no intention cf accepting our demands. The door of negotiations has been shut in our face. Under these circumstances, a heavy responsibility lay upon the British and the Indian Governments to settle this question; but equally unfortunately, these Governments have so far failed to face this responsibility.

It is, therefore, greatly to be desired that Government should forthwith announce its decision on this question, so that earnest attention may be devoted to the solution of other constitutional questions that still await a decision. We have repeatedly been assured of the Government's sympathy with th Muslims, as well as other minorities, and their anxious esire to safeguard and secure the position and interests of the minorities. As a proof of these professions, we demand that Government should immediately shoulder the responsibility which it can no longer evade, and thus put an end to the present state of mistrust between the communities.

Kashmir

The affairs of the Muslims of Kashmir have now arrived at a stage where, if the situation is handled with wisdom and discretion, the best results may be expected to ensue. The best generalship consists, not only in knowing and planning how and when to start a campaign, but also in realizing when to call a halt. A lack of this quality has often turned prospective victory into an actual defeat. The initial demands for independent inquiry into the political grievances and disabilities of the Kashmir Muslims, and into the atrocities committed upon them during the course of their gallant struggle for justice and fair treatment, have been conceded; and two Commissions are proceeding with their respective enquiries. The efforts of the

All-India Kashmir Committee and the *Ahrar* have served to focus the attention of the peoples and the Governments of India and Britain upon the affairs of Kashmir, and the stage has now been reached where all our efforts must be directed towards rendering the Muslims of Kashmir such legal and financial assistance as may enable them to place their case fully and to the best advantage before the Commissions of enquiry. Efforts which continue to be directed in other channels can lead to no useful results whatever, and may result in some harm. I would therefore appeal for a calm reconsideration of the whole situation, and for a co-ordination of all efforts towards directions in which they may be expected to yield the most beneficent results.

Anarchical Crime

The next question that urgently claims your attention is the alarming increase of revolutionary and anarchical crime in the country, of which we have witnessed such terrible instances within the course of the last few months. Every one of us must fully realize the gravity of the consequences to the peace, prosperity and future progress of the country, if this wave of violent anarchy is not immediately checked in its course. We must take active steps to combat the forces of anarchy, terrorism and disorder, and do all that lies in us to keep the fair name and honour of our country unstained and unsullied by such dastardly and inhuman crimes."

7

THE SECRET OF SUCCESS*

Gentlemen, this authoritative requisition, signed by 25 (*sic*) elected Muslim leaders of national repute, is my mandate for calling this Session, but I can assure you from the bottom of my heart that our grateful thanks go out to our Howrah Muslim brethren, who on behalf of the Province of Bengal, have extended to us the very kind offer to act as our hosts during this postponed Twenty-third Annual Session of The All-India Muslim League, over which I have the honour to preside, an honour which I legitimately regard as the laurel-wreath of my community's appreciation, more especially so, when I realize that this is a position which has been occupied by some of the ablest sons of India.

I would suggest that it is more than a coincidence that this historic Session of our organization is being held in the very Province which was the birth-place of the League.

It seems to me that in to-day's Session we can see the guiding hand of Providence. I would, therefore, remind you that the All-India Muslim League came into existence in 1906, as an organization with the main object of safeguarding Muslim interests, based on the fundamental principle of keeping the Muslim communal individuality strong and unimpaired in all constitutional readjustments to be made, from time to time, in the course of the political advancement of the country as a whole.

*Presidential address delivered by Mian Abdul Aziz (Aziz Group) at the Howrah Session of the Muslim Leaque held on 21 October, 1933.

To-day, that need is even greater than it was 27 years ago, and that is our justification for reminding you to-day of the absolute necessity of utilizing the League for the purpose for which it was founded by some of the best thinkers of the Muslim community, who combined a desire to safeguard the interests of their community with a patriotic fervour to serve the cause of the country in general. The past history of the League is conclusive proof of this assertion.

A Vital Session

To my mind, no annual session of the All-India Muslim League has ever been held in circumstances so pregnant with possibilities, both for good and evil, as this Session. While far-reaching changes in the system of administration in our country, which will produce, in some cases, momentous results, are in the process of accomplishment, the League, which was expressly brought into being with the object of consolidating Muslim effort in India, is itself passing through a crisis of the first magnitude. As the only political organization of the Muslims of India, which has definitely been recognized as such for its achievements in the past, no Muslim can regard the manifestations of disunity that now threaten the very existence of the League with anything but the gravest anxiety. As one who participated in laying the foundations of the League and who has ever since followed its career with the deepest interest, I cannot too strongly lay stress upon the imperative duty of protecting the League, at this juncture, not against the machinations of any external foe, but against the internal dissensions of those who, whilst owning allegiance to its political creed, do not hesitate to fight against us in our endeavours to make the League more representative and powerful.

It would be hypocritical on my part to conceal the fact that ever since my election as President, I have found all my efforts to place the affairs of the League on a sound footing hampered, and, at times, even checked, by individuals constituting a group which—if I may put it so charitably—held views

diametrically opposed to mine as to the future dispensation of the League. It is for you to judge between me and those who differ from me; but whatever your judgment, may I earnestly plead with you, with all the force I can command, that you should see to it that the maintenance of the integrity of the League as the great political organization of the Muslims of India is in no way impaired, and, what is more, that provision is also made for the establishment, on firm and unshakable foundations, of the League as the authoritative political organ of Muslim opinion in this country.

If I have opposed recent attempts made to influence certain decisions in respect of the League, I have done so on constitutional grounds. Any political organization whose constitutionally elected officers could be brushed aside by any group of its members who nurtured a grievance, real or imaginary, would command no influence, and if those office-bearers yielded to the unconstitutional threats of the disaffected elements, they would directly contribute to the destruction of the power wielded by that organization. My sole object, in resisting the pressure brought upon me to abandon what I was constitutionally called upon to consider as a sacred charge, has been to prevent the total extinction, and thus preserve the efficacy of the League as a dynamic political force.

The Communal Award

Here, for a moment with your permission, I propose to pass under survey, briefly, some of the problems which are engaging the attention of Muslims. To begin with, there is the Communal Award. The conditions producing it have been unfortunate from the wider aspect of national interests. There were no prospects of a voluntary settlement of the points at issue between the major communities, and this led to the intervention of His Majesty's Government and the consequent promulgation of the Communal Award. In the circumstances, we Muslims must accept the settlement outlined by the Award as an accomplished fact, even though some of its provisions do not come up to our expectations, which were based on definite

promises made to us by the Prime Minister, consistent with the justice of our cause; and, while earnestly endeavouring to produce that unity among the different communities which along can raise India to the height of a nation, we must abide by that decision.

The Princes and the Federation

We are also vitally interested, both as Muslims and Indians, in the prospect of the entry of Indian States into the Federation of the future. We must rejoice at this prospect, as it woud herald the dawn of an India inspired by a common ideal of service and citizenship. At the same time, we must register our emphatic opinion that we desire to see the representation of Muslims in the Federal Legislature ineradically maintained at one third of the total strength of the whole, including the Indian States.

Concord Badly Needed

Similarly, in regard to the representation of Muslims in the public services, I ask you to make it clear beyond any shadow of doubt that while you cordially endorse the principle of Indianization of these services, you are determined to see that Muslims secure adequate representation in them. We say this not from any sense of antagonism towards other communities, but because, unfortunately for India, the major communities, have not found it possible to see eye to eye so far as questions affecting public concern are involved. This is, indeed, unfortunate; and in this connection, I desire to draw your earnest attention to the fact that the creed of the League is based on the promotion of concord between the Muslims and sister communities. I hold firmly the belief that unless there is unity between the two major communities, or a *modus vi.endi* l as been found which may ultimately lead to the creation of common interests, no matter what the changes introduced by the reforms, they will not produce the results one can reasonably expect from them. For this reason, I would be wanting in my sense of duty if I did not appeal to both Hindus and

Muslims to take a long view of the political problem that confronts us at this juncture, and, while taking every step to safeguard their individual interests, to come together on a platform that is common to both national interests.

Provincial Autonomy

So far as national interests are concerned, I see provincial autonomy emerging from the discussions now in progress, and I sincerely trust that before long the reign of provincial autonomy will begin. How long the ideal of Federation will take to materialize, no one can definitely say; but I hope that it will not be long before there is a Federal system in operation. It will be the concern of the League to see that during the transitional stage, when decisions affecting the introduction of Federation are being taken, the true interests of our community are safeguarded.

Tribute to His Highness the Aga Khan

The Round-Table Conference in London has happily shown us the way how to deal with problems which appeared at first sight to be insoluble, and, in this connection, I desire - and I am sure every Muslim in India desires with me – to pay a tribute to the great services which His Highness the Aga Khan has rendered during the deliberations of the Round-Table Conference and the sessions of the Joint Parliamentary Committee to the cause of Muslims in India.

Emancipation of Women

We have also reason to note with satisfaction the progress foreshadowed in the discussions in London on the representation of women in the Legislatures. This is an unmistakable sign of the progress of India, and we Muslims, with our traditional interest in the emancipation of women, extend our unqualified support to the measures which are being adopted in order to secure adequate representation for women in the new Legislatures and other public bodies.

Economic Depression

Before we pass to questions of purely Muslim interest, I must refer to a question which intimately affects all of us in India, I mean the economic depression. It is a matter for thankfulness that while it cannot yet be definitely said that the depression has passed, there are still clear indications of a change for the better. In this connection, I should like to point out that although the conditions created by the economic draught were found prevailing throughout the world, and by no means local, yet in India their effect was intensified by that curse of our country, agricultural indebtedness. I am glad, therefore, to find that the United Provinces Government is taking active measures to cope with the serious problem of agricultural indebtedness, and that there is a prospect of similar measures being adopted in the Punjab and the North-West Frontier Province.

I understand that the Government of Bengal is also alive to the importance of the subject, and therefore necessary measures are receiving the attention of the Government in dealing with these questions.

Terrorism Must Go

There is also the manifestation of the spirit of terrorism in some parts of Bengal which demands the serious attention of every patriotic Indian. This is a development which is entirely foreign to the traditions of India. It stands condemned in unqualified terms by every religion in India. The misguided youths who have mistaken it for patriotism, are not only enemies of orderly government and, therefore, of orderly existence, and the country, but their own enemies. No country can prosper by accepting organized murder as its political creed.

Reserve Bank Bill

To turn to more pleasant subjects, we have recently seen a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses of the Indian Legis-

lature appointed to pass under review the Reserve Bank Bill. As the establishment of a Reserve Bank is a condition precedent to the establishment of a Federation in India, we are greatly interested in seeing the labours of the joint Committee successfully concluded, so that a Reserve Bank may come into existence as early as possible.

Progress in the North

So far as subjects of purely Muslim concern go, we have cause for gratification at the progress which the North-West Frontier Province has made; and I personally have every reason for satisfaction, because as long ago as 1909, when the late Sir Ali Imam and I went to London to present the Muslim case before Lord Morley, the question of bringing the North-West Frontier Province—my own province—administratively into line with the other provinces in India was mooted. To-day, I have the satisfaction of knowing that my mission has not been in vain. I hope, however, to see that the Islamia College in Peshawar is raised to the status of a university, so that the cause of education in the province may advance more rap dly than it otherwise would. We Muslims have also cause for satisfaction in the decision taken recently to create a new Province of Sind. We are sure that this would improve the prospects of the advancement of Muslims in the new Province, and, at the same time, be of benefit to the rest of India.

On this subject, it is also urged that suitable reforms should be introduced into Baluchistan for the enjoyment of a representative form of government by the people of this Province, which is as important as the North-West Frontier Province

Trade Negotiations with Japan

I find that for the first time in the history of India for some considerable number of years, a foreign Government has sent its envoy and representatives to our country to discuss, with representatives of the Government of India, questions of mutual interest in trade. There have also been representatives

of great industries in Great Britain, Japan and India in conference in Simla straining to arrive at an understanding in regard to trade with India. I am an ardent believer in *Swadeshi*, in the true sense of the word, but I dissent from those who believe in economic isolation. I, therefore, hope that as a result of the trade conferences which have been held in Simla, an impetus may be given to India's trade with both the Empire and non-Empire countries. I believe this exchange of commodities, which inevitably results in exchange of ideas, will also stimulate true *Swadeshi* enterprises in India, and lead to a better understanding, generally, between India and such neighbouring countries as Japan.

Indians in South Africa

In passing, I may refer to the assurance given by His Excellency the Viceroy, in his address to the Joint Session of the Indian Legislature, of the satisfactory manner in which the question of Indians in South Africa was being handled. This has given rise to the hope that one of the outstanding questions of the day, that affecting the welfare of our brethren in that Dominion, will soon be satisfactorily settled.

Afghanistan

I may also refer to the reports of sustained progress which Afghanistan is making under the benign rule of His Majesty King Nadir Shah, which are sure to be received with great satisfaction by Muslims in India. The relations of the British Government and our neighbour, Afghanistan, happily continue to be cordial. I feel that Afghanistan has now its course set definitely for progress, politically, economically and educationally, all of which is entirely due to the self-sacrificing zeal of that eminent statesman and soldier, King Nadir Shah, the saviour of Afghanistan.

A Call to Unity

To revert to the problem immediately facing Muslims in India, it is incumbent upon us to consider how far we are in a position so to marshal our political forces as to be able to influence the great decisions which are about to be taken affecting the future system of administration in India. I would be guilty of deluding you into a false belief if I told you that we are in such a position, or that the League is as effective a political organization as it ought to be. Recent dissensions in its ranks have seriously jeopardized its value as a political force. I have related the causes of these dissensions. I have pointed out the differences that have arisen between me, as President of the League, and a few others. I may also mention that these differences did not have their origin on my side; but whatever their origin, I am prepared to extend a cordial invitation to those within the League who have differed with me to join hands with me in making the League what it is meant to be. I also desire to impress upon other Muslims who have been so far occupied with creating what may be called rival organizations of the League seriously to consider the inadvisability of giving even a semblance of division among Muslims —a community by no means as effectively organized politically as others in India. In the multiplicity of such organizations, no matter what their labels, lurks political disaster.

There are no vital points at issue, for instance, between the League and the Muslim Conference, and there is no logical reason why the latter should not now abandon its lonely furrow and put its hand to the League plough. Those now in favour of upholding the Conference as a separate organization perhaps feel that their activities on behalf of their community cannot find ample scope within the League; but I may assure them that we intend to take decisions at this Session of the League which will make of it an organization vibrant with a new strength and hope, not only for Muslims in one province or two, but for Muslims throughout India. Such an organization as we to-day visualize the League becoming, will demand

the co-operation of all Muslims, I therefore appeal to our brethren of the Muslim Conference, and also of other Muslim organizations throughout India, to help us to-day in raising the standard of the All-India Muslim League as the unchallenged exponent of Muslim opinion in India.

If this humble appeal of mine finds an echo, words cannot describe the galvanic effect it will produce ón the destiny of Muslims in India. I earnestly pray that it will. Dissension has already done incalculable harm to the Muslim cause. Momentous decisions are about to be taken by the Joint Parliamentary Committee in London; and if ever there was a time in the history of Muslims in India when there was need for a united front, this is the time. Those who now oppose the forces which are drawing the Muslims together in the League will have to answer before the bar of history, for the consequences of disunion at this stage would be calamitous. It is not too late, even now, to make amends for our mistakes of the past, and, casting aside all petty considerations prompted by personal pique, to unite in a noble effort to make the League a parliament of all Muslims in India, so that it may speak with authority in their name.

I have said enough to point out the pregnancy of the present Session of the League. Whether we like it or not, its decisions will make history, not only for the Muslims, but for the whole of India, and even beyond the confines of India. They will be an open book for the world to read, and, reading it, to arrive at an understanding of the political capacity of Muslims in India.

It is, for this season, our solemn duty not to allow extraneous factors to sway our decisions. Firstly, because the true interests of every Muslim in India, in every town and village, rich and poor alike, demand of us that we do our best for them at this critical time; and secondly, because the future of our great sister community demands that Muslims give of their best in the administration that lies ahead. Our Hindu comrades

need have no fears about our plans for political organization, for real inter-communal co-operation can only be successful if all concerned are fully prepared and equipped to work with the fullest measure of efficiency. Just as modern science has demonstrated that mechanical progress is most rapid and steady with twin aeroplane engines of equal horsepower, even so can we rest assured that India's political progress can only be achieved when the two great communities are like throbbing engines pulsating in rhythmic unity. And the great task of the All-India Muslim League is to work for that ideal.

8

THE ACID TEST OF SUCCESS OF CONSTITUTIONAL REFORMS*

At the very outset, it is my most melancholy duty to mourn the death of Sir Muhammad Shafi, Sir Syed Ali Imam, Sir Mohammad Fakhruddin, Syed Hasan Imam and Khwaja Kamaluddin—all these were great in their line, greater still in their love for Islam. All of them were, in one way or other, connected with the All-India Muslim League, with unique and unsurpassed service of the credit of each. May their souls rest in peace. To their families and relations we offer our respectful sympathies in their bereavement.

In July last, the Council of the All-India Muslim League decided, under Rule 26 of the Rules of the Constitution of the League, to convene the annual meeting of the League in this historic city of the Mughals, and invited me to become the President. I confess to a feeling of embarrassment on my election, for I have always abstained from the limelight, and have been an unobtrusive worker in the cause of the country and the community. I had, however, no alternative left to me but to accept the honour, and I stand here before you to-day acknowledging, with gratitude, this marked token of confidence. Nevertheless, I am conscious of the fact that the position demands earnest and intensive work in the cause of the community. The situation has been intensified for more than one reason. In the first place, the unfortunate rift in the League should attract our immediate attention. You, gentlemen, as

*Presidential address delivered by Hafiz Hidayat Hussain (Hidayat Group) at the Delhi Session held on 25-26 November, 1933.

representatives of the community, have to determine in what light to treat demonstrations by an unrepresentative party caucus.

Reorganizing Muslim Unity

Efforts, however, must be directed towards bringing all Muslims under the banner of the League; and I have no doubt that with but little effort all cobwebs will be swept away as vapour does before a storm. This takes me to the consideration of other All-India Muslim organizations. I acknowledge the most excellent work that has been done so far by all these institutions. Who dare deny the splendid constructive work of the All-India Muslim Conference, who can impugn the achievements of the All-India Khilafat Conference, who can doubt the lead of the All-India Jamiat-ul-Ulema? But all these institutions suffer from an indistinct line of demarcation in the field of their activities. There is an overlapping of their functions, and there is no division of labour. I most earnestly wish that, instead of frittering away energies by running parallel political organizations with identical programmes, the lines of demarcation for the several institutions should be made more distinct. Without presuming to allot duties to other institutions, I trust it will not be denied that for the political rejuvenation of the Muslims of India, the All-India Muslim League is the fittest organization. It is borne the brunt of the work in the past; it is prepared to shoulder the responsibilities in the future. I confess to a period of ennui in the history of the League, and that too at a time when the need for a right lead to the community was the sorest. There was a similar split in the past as you see to-day, and the League lost its pre-eminent position in the political history of India and abroad. Let me very humbly warn you to beware. History is repeating itself. The enemies of the community are again at work; and disruptive forces are out with crocodile tears. This is the time for aggregation, not segregation. In aggregation lies our real strength. Let us bend our energies together to work with an honesty of purpose and singleness of aim for the saftey and uplift of our community. On no occasion and in

no circumstance, would you find me lacking in the performance of my duties as a common soldier, following the lead of my leaders, haversack on my shoulders.

I have claimed that the All-India Muslim League has a pre-eminent position in the political history of India. I crave your indulgence to refer you very briefly to the very genesis and history of the League to make my meaning clear.

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan passed away in 1898, and with him, the Upper India Defence Association of the Musalmans. In 1901, when a great controversy raged round the question of the script and language to be used in the courts of the United Provinces, the Muslims of India lacked the servies of a political organization. It was then that the late Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk Moulvi Mushtaq Husain put before the Musalmans his scheme for the formation of a political association for the Musalmans, with the object of protecting and advancing their interests. The Association was still in an inchoate state when events of great magnitude occurred both in India and in England. he Musalmans were galvanized by these great events, and their leading men spontaneously came to think that the times required instant action, if self-preservation, in the political deluge that looked like swamping them as a community, was at all to be aimed at. The result of these deliberations was the famous Deputation to Lord Minto that went to Simla on October 1, 1906. The most important points which the Deputation pressed upon the Governor-General's attention, and which have since formed the basic plank of all Muslim claims, were two. In the first place, the Muslims claimed to be an Indian minority with a distinct culture and civilization of their own; and consequently they urged that they could no longer be treated as though they were a small factor that might, without unfairness, be neglected. In the second place, the Government was pressed to devise a scheme to select really representative men to represent Musalman interests. The Deputation also felt that the community must, in the conditions of India that were then emerging, point out to Government a representative body of men whom it could unhesita-

tingly accept as such. This was considered, both at Lucknow, where the draft of the Address was adopted, and at Simla, where the Address was presented; and it was deemed necessary to assemble a larger body of Musalmans to discuss the desirability of forming a political league of the community. In December, 1906, taking advantage of the session of the All-India Educational Conference at Dacca, the late Hon'ble Nawab Salimullah Bahadur circulated a tentative scheme for the formation of a confederacy, and invited a large number of leaders of thought among the Musalmans to Dacca to take part in the discussions. Several hundred gentlemen travelled to Dacca for the purpose; several thousands came from the Province of Eastern Bengal. As a result of these deliberations, the All-India Muslim League was founded at Dacca on December 30, 1906, and adopted the principles of the Address as its political creed. It has since fought the Muslim battle single-handed; its initial creed is still, over a quarter of a century later, the political creed of the Muslims of India.

When I look back over the vista of great names and great achievements that are indissolubly associated with the All-India Muslim League, I shudder to think what incalculable harm parties riven asunder from the body of the League may not cause. I therefore appeal once more to all the members of my community to cast off their petty differences; for are we not all united in the sole object of our mission—service to our country and our community? It is difficult to say that there should be no differences of opinion; honest differences should be encouraged rather than discouraged, for they are signs of life. But if we keep in mind those essentials, the bedrock on which the organization of the All-India Muslim League is founded, I have no doubt that our contribution to the service of the community and the country will not be insignificant.

In order to give the community as a whole that political education which is requisite for its political existence, there should be created, in every Province and in every headquarter of a district—even in every tehsil or *taluqa*—branches of the League to safeguard Muslim interests and to awaken among

the Muslim public that consciousness which would ensure their safety and would contribute to the uplift of the country. The Muslims thus organized will then be a power for good in the land and their political organization—the All-India Muslim League—a really dynamic political force. I lay special emphasis on the political education of Musalmans for the reason that now that the orientation of Government is going to be radically different from that to which they have in the past been accustomed, and now that real political power is being vested in the hands of the public, the Muslim public must be made to appreciate the dangers that lie ahead of them, if their policy of *laissez-faire* in matters political does not undergo a change. With political education and political organization, the Muslims will be a factor in the land whose influence would be irresistibly felt in every walk of life. I believe in work among our masses.

The Distortion of Pan-Islamism

It is a fashion these days to charge the Muslims of India with pursuing a policy of segregation in politics and, as a logical corollary, being Pan-Islamists in their views. The barrenness and the fatuity of this charge have been exposed threadbare on more than one occasion. If I refer to it here, it is because I know from personal knowledge that propaganda pursued on these lines is consistently being carried on in India, and even more so in England, and that it has gained the support of some of those Members of Parliament who look at things only superficially ard whose training and knowledge do not take them below the surface. All democratic institutions presuppose responsibility to the public. The Muslims are in a numerical minority throughout India, and also in all big provinces except the Punjab and Bengal. In both the latter provinces, their majority is only a bare majority and not an absolute majority like the one the great sister community of the Hindus enjoys in all the other provinces. Would legislatures composed of representatives drawn almost wholly from such absolute majorities be the representatives of the entire

public, and would such legislatures answer the description of democratic institutions? No Musalman has ever impugned the right of the Hindu majorities to be in a majority in the central legislatures, and in all those provinces where they are in a majority. If Muslims have asked for weightage, it is only to make them effective minorities in legislatures; in no case have they asked for representation which will bring them to the level of the minorities in the Punjab and Bengal Councils. Is it then fair for the majotity community to agitate for the break up of a mere nominal Muslim majority in the Punjab and for a possible equality in Bengal—and all this in the name of nationalism? I know that in derogation of these rights, of the Punjab particularly, the bogey of Pan-Islamic and Afghan invasions are set up; and when in England last year, I listened to many morbidly emotional speeches that were delivered on the subject by some of those whom one would have credited with looking at things from a truer perspective. This talk of Pan-Islamism is nothing more, to my mind, than mere hallucination.

The idea of *political* Pan-Islamism, in the sense of unifying Muslims into one State, never existed; the ideal of Pan-Islamism is humanitarian, its meaning being that Islam is a factor for the combination of all races and nations, and that it does not recognize the barriers of race, nationality or geographical frontiers. It has never meant that the Indian Musalman has his face turned to Mecca and his back to India. It must be distinctly understood that the interests of the Musalmans of India are centred on affairs relating to India, and not on those outside India, and that the Musalman is as much a part of the Indian nation as any other people living in this land of ours. This bogy of Pan-Islamism is raised in order to injure the legitimate demands of the Muslims, by striking terror in the minds of Europeans and Americans, and has been helpful in enlisting sympathies in England of some of those Members of Parliament whom I have above described. It is doing great injustice to the Muslims to say and preach

that the political interests of the Muslims are in serious and permanent conflict with the political interests of non-Muslims. I have said before that the All-India Muslim League is founded on the principle of protecting and advancing the Muslims' own separate interests, but working in unison with other political organizations for the uplift of the country. No doubt differences between the two communities are inevitable;, but the question of conflct arises only when it is sought to deny this difference. It is only by a simple recognition of these differences that an organic whole, which it is the ambition of all patriotic citizens of India to build, can be formed.

Constitutional Issues

It is blurring the issue to invoke the period of the reforms of 1909 and 1916. None of these was destined to give real power to the people. The Constitution now envisaged is different from its predecessors. When real power is to come to the people, every community has a right to ask if it is in the picture in proportion to its importance; for if this is not so, the new Constitution must inevitably fail. The right of the majority to rule is always subject to the necessity that it should not outrage the feelings of the minority; for in that event, the latter is tolerably certain to fight in defence of its position. In a country like India where a majority can never become a minority and a minority can never aspire to become a majority, this is particularly true. Patriotism therefore requires that the rights of all minorities, and particularly of such an important minority as that of the Muslims of India, must be rigidly safeguarded before any new Constitution is launched. Muslim demands have been reiterated from the platforms of the All-India Muslim League and the All-India Muslim Con erence; and the Muslims have repeatedly entered into negotiations with the representatives of the majority community to satisfy the Muslims on these demands. Attempts were renewed at successive Round-Table Conferences; but everybody now knows that, over the question of one single seat in the Punjab, the

promised blank cheque was torn into shreds on the first occasion, and on the second occasion, the reactionary forces overcame even the sole representative of the Congress, Gandhiji.

The decision of the communal question was forced on His Majesty's Government by the contending parties not having been able to come to any understanding between themselves. Now when the decision has been given, its reversal is sought, by means which hardly do credit, either to the political sagacity or even the political honesty of those or our contrymen who cry the loudest against it. The communal question has again been opened without regard to the fact that this means retarding the progress of the country, however unconsciously. A section now looks to the League of Nations for a solution; it wants a reference to it. These doctrinaire politicians forget that under the Constitution of the League of Nations, its functions are confined to international problems, i.e., problems which affect one independent country and nation in relation to another independent country and nation, and that the League of Nations is prohibited, by its very Constitution, from meddling in the internal questions of a State, for example, the communal problem within the geographical limits of India. Secondly, even if the League of Nations were not so precluded, where is its executive authority to enforce its decisions. Political forms of themselves accomplish nothing; their value depends upon the spirit which energizes them towards their appointed end. An institution or a form of Government which mirrored the distribution of opinion in society would be of no avail unless there was common agreement among its members about the principles they were to maintain. If, suppose, the decision of the League of Nations went against the Hindu Mahasabhaists—and by all accounts that is the most powerful organization among the Hindus to-day—what guarantee is there that that decision would be accepted? Thirdly, what has the League of Nations been able to do so far? It is notorious that its Minorities Committee meets but seldom, and that its decisions have not satisfied the minorities in countries which

may be said to be homogeneous—and the reason is not far to seek. True, that there is gathered in the Assembly of the League each year as distinguished a collection of statesmen as it is possible to bring together in the modern world; but the absence from among them of that common mind about the range and intensity of international action which alone could make the League of Nations amply creative deprives it of essential effectiveness. Witness, in support of my statement, the recent exit from the League of a Power's representative. It is an irony of fate that, synchronizing with the pathetic appeals for reference to the League of Nations of the communal question of India that were lately being made at Ajmere, the League of Nations was being set at naught by a major Power on international questions. The League of Nations is wholly unacquainted with Indian conditions—how can it be entrusted with the task of solving Indian communal problems? Let us get away from the headlines, the phrases and sensational perorations, and get down to facts, and consider quietly and dispassionately how the new problems could best be met.

The constructive approach demands that questions which have been decided should not be re-opened, and that our vision should be directed on to the onward march Representative Muslims have said, more than once, that the Award has not satisfied the Muslims; it has not given them their due share in the Punjab and Bengal; it keeps the Frontier Provinces in shackles; it makes no pronouncement regarding Baluchistan; the Sindh question is put in Tartarus; the services question, the language question, the question of personal law, and sundry others which most vitally affect the Muslim in his day-to-day life remain unsolved. If, therefore, anybody has a cause for grievance against the Award, it is the Muslim: but partriotism has shown them a wiser course of not retarding the progress of the country by immediately disowning the Award. They reserve heir fight for the things which are their due—by all canons of law and justice and in all consistency wi'h the principles of democratic institutions—for proper occasions; they will continue the fight to secure their country what the

Government of His Majesty is committed to: the attainment of fully responsible self-government for India. This is the Muslim policy; and I have no doubt in my mind that it is the correct policy.

Muslims Demands

I revert now to matters which pertain to those Muslim demands whose acceptance, as I have before explained, must be the *sine qua non* of all common agreements among the constituent communities of India for their support of the principles which underlie the future Constitution. These demands have been formulated over and over again, and have recently been placed before the Minorities Committee of the Round-Table Conference, by the late Sir Muhammad Shafi and by my humble self in a brochure that I published in London in January 1931 and circulated among the members of the Round-Table Conference. Some of the demands – as for example, grant of complete fiscal, legislative and administrative autonomy to the provinces, along with Residuary Powers; federation; separation of Sindh from Bombay; raising the Frontier Province and Baluchistan to the status of equality with other provinces in British India – are matters which are not exclusively Muslim demands. They have been advanced from non-Muslim platforms on more than one occasion; but if anything is urged against them now, the tragedy is that it is urged on communal grounds. Residuary Powers for the provinces are opposed because their grant would make Provinces like the Punjab and Bengal independent of the Centre in all important matters – a Centre in which the utmost that the Muslims can claim is a third of the seats in the Federal Legislatures. The separation of Sindh - a province no bigger than some of the commissionerships of the United Provinces – is objected to because its population will have a majority of Muslims. Subvention by the Federal Government is objected to both for the Frontier Province and Sindh, but not for Orissa.

Of all the exclusively Muslim demands, I place the public

services in the forefront. The question of the services is not a question of bread and butter alone—though this by itself is not negligible—but a question of service to the community and country, and the influence it wields. Unemployment among Muslim young men is increasing; and I therefore advocate increasing employment for them, particularly in the military and police forces, for which the Muslims have shown special aptitude. Statistics show that in many departments of both the Imperial and Provincial Governments the Muslims find no entrance. It is therefore essential that in all departments under the control of the Government of India or the Provincial Governments, including all institutions to whom grants in any form are given by either the Central or Provincial Government, the Muslim element in the services should be fixed in proportion to Muslim seats in the various relevant legislatures and that the fixation of this proportion should not be dependent merely on convention, but should have the sanction of law or statutory regulations. In the military and police the proportion of Muslims should be higher. It is of utmost importance that the claims of the Muslims in every branch of the services should be recognized, and that even in the formation of ministries constitutional prescriptions should be laid down for the appointment of Muslim ministers in the same proportion as that of the services. Under the White Paper proposals, there is no prescription that the ministry must be formed on the advice of the Chief Minister. Therefore, if the method of forming a ministry is left to develop in each province by usage in accordance with prevailing conditions, it is quite possible that no Muslim may be able to join a ministry in provinces where they are in minority.

The acid test of the success of the new reforms will be in their settlement of economic differences between various sectors; and one of these issues lies in the apportionment of the services. The Muslims' claim for an adequate proportion in the services must be statutorily settled. He does not claim employment merely on the basis of communal consideration. Well-qualified men among the Muslims are available, and have

been available since a long time for employment in every branch of administration. With a proviso for basic qualifications and a latitude for reasonable local conditions, there need be no delay in filling all the statutorily sanctioned posts. What the Muslim really wants is statutory protection in the services, otherwise there is every likelihood of his being elbowed out, as is happening in some cases even now—and in favour of those of other communities who are less qualified. The only reason for this is that the Muslim-s cannot claim the patronage of the employers, or of those whose influence counts towards securing employment.

I will briefly outline the demand of the Muslims community, so that there may be no mistake about them. In the forefront of these is the demand for separate electorates, which the Muslims are not, in the circumstances presently obtaining in the country, prepared to forego. So far, it is this demand, along with the Muslim seats in Bengal and Punjab, representation in the Central Legislature, and separation of Sind, which has been dealt with by His Majesty's Government; and it is to be regretted that the Prime Minister's declaration at the First Round-Table Conference, that in no province would a majority community be reduced to the position of a minority or an equality, has been violated, particularly in the case of Bengal. The Government has, however, not yet made up its mind with regard to other equally vital demands of the Muslims : for example, their share in the services; provision for the appointment of ministers from the Muslim community (both of which I have already dealt with above); safeguards for Muslim personal laws; protection of religion and the safe performance of religious rites; educational facilities: language and script; establishment of *Qazi's* courts; Muslim seats numbering one-third of the total membership in both the Federal Legislatures; introduction of substantial reforms in Baluchistan. All these are matters which need the immediate attention of the Government.

The White Paper Scheme

The White Paper Scheme is no doubt an advance on the present Constitution; it is also a great step forwards towards the achievement of responsible government. Conservative opinion in England, led to some extent by Mr. Winston Churchill and Lord Lloyd, is creating an atmosphere in England which is very hostile to India—against giving it further powers, particularly in the field of law and order in the provinces, and for whittling down responsibility at the Centre. I think, however, that Government will be backed by a sufficient majority in Parliament, and outside, to carry the White Paper Scheme through; for, firstly, no real alternative to the general scheme of the White Paper has been propounded, even by the intelligence of Mr. Churchill, and, secondly, because responsible Indian opinion is veering round to the acceptance of this Scheme.

Not that I entirely approve of the White Paper; on the contrary, I am profoundly disappointed with many of its provisions. The Scheme does not grant as large a measure of fiscal, legislative and administrative autonomy to the provinces as it should. It makes no mention of the grant of Residuary Powers to the provinces; it gives very excessive powers to the Governor-General and the Governor, particularly in the field of legislation; it does not make the High Courts exclusively Provincial subjects, it gives weightage and other discriminatory privileges to Indian States; it does not give the Muslims one-third of all seats in the Central Legislatures; it invokes the principle of a joint electorate in the elections to the Upper House of the Federal Legislature; it makes poor provision for the representation of Delhi Muslims in the Federal Legislatures; it makes no provision for representation of an adequate number of Muslim zemindars, Muslim labour, and Muslim commerce. All these are matters to secure for which insistent efforts will have to be made persistently. I do not, all the same, share the pessimism of those who would rather be content with the *status quo* than accept the new Reform Scheme.

This is a counsel of despair, though obviously with no sinister motive as its background. My humble advice is to co-operate and work out the reforms in a truly loyal spirit, and to go on consistently agitating, within constitutional limits, for further reforms.

The White Paper Scheme is yet a mere proposal, susceptible of unlimited editing by the Joint Parliamentary Committee. To condemn it outright, resolving the whole question by an article of faith, may be heroic, but it is wholly unsuited to politics. Accommodation and compromise are the only methods of progress in politics. The picture of the Constitution painted in the White Paper is a Federation of all units, composed of the provinces and the Indian States, at the Centre, and autonomy for the provinces. Federation, responsibility, and safeguards are the three legs of the constitutional tripod, and I will briefly deal with these three:

Federation: In the composition of the Centre, unless all the units composing the Centre possess full and equal rights, federation of the unequal States or units becomes meaningless. It is essential, therefore, that all units composing the Centre should possess the largest measure of autonomy, inclusive of the Residuary Powers, if the machinery at the Centre is to be adjusted adequately to the proportions of the problems to be solved; otherwise conflicts and difficulties are bound to occur.

Responsibility: It should not be forgotten that this is not a mere matter of policy, but is also a question of psychology. The present form of government at the Centre is not only very far from strong, but is entirely incompatible with autonomous units. Not only this, but the Princes of India have unequivocally declared that one of the conditions of their participation was responsibility at the Centre. Federation and responsibility therefore go together.

Safeguards : For the first time in the constitutional history of the country, power is being transferred from the Crown to

the people of India. So far, India has been governed by the people of England; and these people are not anxious that safeguards of an effective nature should be embodied in the Constitution, and that these safeguards must environ the Constitution in its infancy. Particularly so, because the Constitution being framed for India, firstly, postulates the break up of the unitary system, and, secondly, creates, units for a Federation which, unlike the united and the new Germanic States, are non-existent in India so far.

These safeguards are of two kinds : one for the safety of the Constitution and the other for the safety of the minorities. Those for the safety of the Constitution are couched in very broad and general terms. If it is meant, as it is professed, that these safeguards will come into operation only in extreme cases, and only when there is a real conflict between public opinion, as reflected in the Legislature, and Governor-General or Governor, then the safeguards must be made definite and beyond doubt. The sphere of interference of the Governor-General and the Governors must be very strictly defined, so that the Legislature and the country might, in the circumstances of a given case, know who was right and who wrong: otherwise there would always be a chance of constant friction and consequent breakdown of the Constitution. Two of the most important safeguards are those relating to (i) financial stability and credit of Federation: (ii) prevention of commercial discrimination. It is only gainsaid (by the White Paper) that there could be no effective transfer of responsibility unless there is, at the same time, an effective transfer of financial control. The White Paper has, to a certain extent, transferred financial control, and the safeguard relating to finances can come into play only when, on account of the minister borrowing recklessly or at exorbitant rates of interest, a breakdown of the Constitution is feared. But very unfortunately for the Finance Minister, though he will have authority. relating to all the subjects pertaining to his Department as for example, the raising of revenue, the allocation of expenditure

and the programme of external and internal borrowing—he will be seriously handicapped in the discharge of his duties by the large bulk of income earmarked for expenditure in departments which are beyond his reach. Defence swallows the largest bulk of our income. Expenditure for thè army has not been appreciably cut down. Only such armies should be maintained in India which are indispensable for its safety, and a definite programme should be laid down for the Indianization of the army. The process of Indianization should be more rapid, and as I have said before, young Muslims should be reeruited in increasing numbers in the army. It is only thus that the country will be relieved of the heavy incubus of expenditure; and the money thus released could be devoted to the nation-building departments. Otherwise, the position of the Finance Minister, despite the powers that he may possess, would be anomalous in the extreme.

The second safeguard to which I want to refer relates to the prevention of commercial discrimination. The proposal in the White Paper goes very much further than what was agreed at the Round-Table Conference. It is important that the key national industries, inclusive of cottage industries, so far throttled by the dumping of foreign goods should be safeguarded, even under powers of retaliation, as against foreign industries; otherwise the new Constitution will not begin with a happy augury for those arts and crafts in the manipulation of which Indian hands played such an important part, and which were eventually maimed by the substitution of machinery, unfair and, at times, cruel use of power, and an uncontrollable passion for gold

The other class of safeguards for the safety of the minorities is misplaced. If the safeguard is meant for the welfare of a minority, it should be in the hands of a minority to bring it into operation when needed. This will give the minorities interest in the administration, and will also give them a sense of responsibility, for nothing breeds a sense of responsibility so much as the exercise of responsibility. If the operation of this

class of safeguards were left in otherhands than those for whose benefit it was devised, the experiences of the present system of administration, affording obvious examples of its barrenness and the fecundity with which irresponsibility breeds irresponsibility, would be repeated.

The Reserve Bank and Exchange Control

Let me now turn to the question of the Reserve Bank, which is engaging the attention of the country. It is important to recollect that a condition precedent to the establishment of a Federal Government is the inauguration of a Reserve Bank. The Reserve Bank, with the Governor-General behind it, will be entrusted with the control of currency and exchange. Thus the operations of the Reserve Bank will remain independent of the people's control. I am afraid this will not be acceptable to India. The Bank should be a shareholder's Bank, and should be free from political influence. Its capital should be largely Indian, as also its Directorate. There must be a good leaven of Indian officers in its management. The Bill, as introduced in the Assembly, provides for a minimum holding of gold and bullion of the value of Rs. 35 crore. To my mind, the amount is inadequate, and should in no case be less than Rs. 50 crore. The gold resources should be conserved by placing an embargo on the export of gold. Last of all, the Indian Legislature should have the right to amend the Reserve Bank Act without reference to Parliament or Secretary of State.

In close alliance with this subject, is the question of the exchange ratio and the linking of the rupee with the pound sterling. I have no doubt that the latter has kept the pendulum steady in India, and has resulted in keeping the finances on a stable basis; but keeping the possibilities of the future in view, power should be reserved to de-link the rupee from the pound sterling whenever it may be found desirable to do so. The ratio fixed at 18d., however, has been to the distinct disadvantage of India. All the world over, wholesale prices of

commodities have certainly dropped; but the drop has been more preciptous and s teep in this agricultural country of ours than it could have been anywhere else. It is, therefore, essential that the ratio should be authoritatively fixed at 16d. to the rupee at the highest.

The Superior Services

Although I fully recognize the absolute necessity of inviting and encouraging British recruits for the superior services of India for sometime to come, I am equally anxious to relax the steel frame on as early a date as possible. To secure this, my solution, which I submitted to the Services Committee of the First Round-Table Conference, is that all services should be provincialized, that there should be A-Class and B-Class Services. The powers and emoluments of both the Services should be the same, but the A-Class should get oversea exchange and other allowances to which members of the Imperial Services are entitled today. The B-Class shall be the present Provincial Services. If this is done, recruitment in Britain will not cease, for conditions of service in India will even then be attractive; and the people will have real control of the services satisfying the requirements of autonomous states.

Elasticity within Limits

There is another important matter relating to the White Paper. Fault has been found with it for being too wooden and inelastic inasmuch as the Scheme set out there has no inherent power of self-determination or self-expansion. I surely think that the Indian Legislature, and, for the matter of that, even the Provincial Legislatures, should have an inherent power of self-determination, as far as the details of the Scheme go; but once the bases of the Scheme have been settled by Parliament, none but Parliament should have the power to abrogate those bases. If this is not done, uncertainty and chaos would ensue.

Quick Implementation

Gentlemen, I have very briefly outlined before you the scheme of administration as it is going to evolve when the new Constitution comes into force. How long the new Constitution will take coming is difficult to prognosticate for the present. I hope it will not take long; for any further delay will defeat the very end in view, that of securing peace in this country. The one immediate call on the Muslim-s will then be to work it whole-heartedly and prove to the world that Indians are fit to shoulder the responsibilities of administration in their own country, despite differences of religion, tradition, culture and history.

Duties of Muslims

If the Muslims have been driven to seek safeguards, the necessity is not of their seeking. The irresistible logic of events, distractions of political vicissitudes and pressures of an economic kind have forced them to the conclusion that unless the new Constitution is hedged with effective safeguards for them, their future existence, compatible with their past history, their traditions and their culture, would be jeopardized. These safeguards, once secured, automatically convert the Muslims into a solid phalanx to secure, by constitutional and fair means, a system of administration for India which will give it an honourable and abiding place in the comity of nations of the world. Let the Muslims of India, however, as well realize their own position. No safeguards, however well entrenched, can give them real relief unless they organize themselves and learn how to stand on their own legs in the future India. The Muslim can even to-day be the deciding factor in Indian politics. Once his position is secured—and his demands are in no way inconsistent with democratic institutions—he has his country to work for. Islam has given India notions of fraternity, equality and justice that no system of religions of the world could inculcate. The Muslim is democratic at heart; he has his mission, and that mission is the service of mankind

in terms of equality and justice. Let this mission be fulfilled once more: and let us all, Muslims and non-Muslims in this country, without minding the differences, work for our common ideal—the glory of the land of our birth.

Palestine

Let me for a moment turn my attention; with your permission, to the happenings outside India; and the one event that has attracted Muslim attention all the world over is the situation in Palestine. The sanctity of Palestine is a matter of faith with the Muslim. It was the Jazirat-ul-Arab that raised the storm of unrest after the Great War. The Arabs are by nature and constitution an independent race. The Arab will not tolerate the creation of a Jewish National State at his expense, come what may. Recent happenings in Palestine, involving the shooting of several Arabs and injuries to many more, demand an immediate enquiry. Jewish immigration must be stopped forthwith. British Imperial interests themselves require that the Balfour Declaration shall be immediately scrapped. I hope that the Government of India will not fail to impress on His Majesty's Government the intensity of feeling created by the present happenings in Palestine among the Muslims the world over, and practically among all Asiatic races.

Afghanistan

We have only very lately read of the diabolical crime committed in Afghanistan. To the Afghans and the Royal family our heart goes out in thir affliction. May Almighty God bestow peace and prosperity to the country of our brave and noble neighbours.

Conclusion

Finally, gentlemen, I need not impress on you the importance of this Session of the League. Your deliberations and your resolutions will be a beacon light for future generations. Time for practical work has arrived. Theories enshrined

ed in resolutions without practical work is not countenanced by the faith of Muslims. Let us be up and doing, and God Almighty, in his unlimited beneficence and mercy, will help us in our just cause. I am aware of the feeling that has been created in the Muslim mind by some of the unkind utterances at the Hindu Mahasabha meetings and the speeches of the itinerant preachers of this body. Let us not be swayed by these feelings. We as Muslims must continue to have faith in the future of the country, and continue to make it as bright as possible. The country does not lack people who recognize that, in the onward march, no fleet can move under full steam till all the vessels of the fleet are made equally powerful. It is our duty, as citizens of India, not to lay behind refuelling in order to take our just place in the onward march. Those that think that they could reach the goal without all the vessels marching together are enemies of the country and are bound to founder.

The Muslims have so far taken an honourable place in the political history of India. They have studiously kept themselves aloof from all subversive movements; they have refused, as a community, to plough the barren sands of non-co-operation; they have made sacrifices worthy of Islam in the cause of the country. Let their future be worthy of their past and worthy of the best traditions of Islam.

9

ATTACK ON THE ACT OF 1935*

In January 1857 broke out what in history is called the Mutiny of the Indian sepoys'. On Monday, May 10, the revolt reached its climax when the mutineers made themselves masters of the city and palace of Delhi. On September 21, Bahadur Shah, the 'aged titular Emperor of India' was arrested by Lieutenant Hudson, and with his arrest vanished the shadow of the great Muslim Empire of India and the Indian Empire of the Indians. Some English historians of India have called the Mutiny a 'fortunate occurrence'. Indeed, a more 'fortunate occurrence' than the Mutiny of 1857 never took place in India. Attempts have also been made to justify such a description of the Mutiny. It has been said that the Mutiny "swept the Indian sky clear of many clouds. It disbanded a lazy pampered army...it replaced an unprogressive, selfish and commercial system of administration by one liberal and enlightened. Lastly it taught India and the world that the English possessed a courage and national spirit which made light of disaster, which never counted whether the odds against them were two or ten to one; and which made them confident of victory although the conditions for success appeared all but hopeless".

Gentlemen, I am half inclined to agree with this description of the Mutiny of 1857—but for different reasons.

---

*Presidential address delivered by Sir Wazir Hasan at the Bombay Session held on 11-12 April, 1936.

Not only the real but the immediate cause of the Mutiny was oppression and economic exploitation of the people of India by that trading corporation, the East India Company. The pages of Indian history dealing with this period are written red with numerous instances of tyranny and economic suffering, and it is not necessary for the purposes of my address to recount them

Sir Syed Ahmad, in his book, *The Causes of the Indian Revolt*, has stated that the extreme poverty of the people of India, particularly of the Musalmans, caused by the numerous oppressive and predatory acts of the East India Company, was one of the chief causes of the Revolt of 1857.

Inspite of the fact that attempts have been made to challenge the opinion expressed by that great statesman and thinker as to the cause of the Indian Mutiny of 1857, all impartial historians have come to agree that Sir Syed's opinion was absolutely correct.

I will now state some of the reasons why I am inclined to share the view that the Mutiny of 1857 was a 'fortunate occurrence'. One of the direct results of the Mutiny was the extinction of the East India Company.

It must be admitted that the death of the Company marked the end of a rule whose depredations had resulted in great misery and suffering for the Indian people. In the days of the East Indian Company, and in the days immediately following its extinction, neither the people of England nor of India had developed the art of camouflaging their actions and policies to such a pitch of perfection as it attained soon after. In those days oppression was called oppression, and exploitation was called exploitation. It is a grim irony that those very interests which were formerly acquired with the help of deception or sheer brute force are now flaunted as legal and legitimate 'rights'.

The Royal Proclamation of 1858

Another reason why I am inclined to agree with the view that the Mutiny of 1857 was 'a fortunate occurrence' is the fact that it was followed by direct connection of the Crown with the Government of India. Her most Gracious Majesty, the late Queen Victoria, issued her famous Proclamation on November 1, 1958 to the Princes and peoples of India. I will beg leave of you to quote a few passages from that Proclamation. Her Majesty said, "We hold ourselves bound to the nations of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and those obligations by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil." This unequivocal language created new hopes and expectations in India.

I presume that the interpretation of the words of Her Late Majesty quoted above will not be disputed. What are then the obligations of duty which bind Her Majesty to the people of India? Firstly, they are the same which bind Her Majesty to all her other subjects, one of such obligations had been fulfilled by the predecessor of Her Majesty to her British subjects by Parliament passing the Reform Act of 1832, and again by passing the two subsequent Reform Acts during the reign of Her Gracious Majesty. The numerous legislative measures passed by Parliament granting self-government to various Dominions can be considered in the same light. The fulfilment of the same 'obligations and duties' to the people of India has still not come to pass, though a period of nearly a century has elapsed since the Queen's pronouncement. Not only have those obligations not been fulfilled, but they are frankly stated by the people of England to be mere illusions and a dim and distant 'goal' of His Majesty's Government in the realms of India.

Another significant and very material part of Her Majesty's Proclamation is as follows:

"And we hereby call upon all our subjects within the said territories to be faithful, and to bear true allegiance to us, our heirs and successors." A few paragraphs after this occurs that part of the Proclamation to which I have already invited your attention. Having regard to the setting of these paragraphs and the scheme of the Proclamation as a whole, it would appear that the several parts of that announcement are inter-dependent If that is so, it further follows that, in consideration of the fulfilment of the obligation of allegiance on the part of the people of India, a promise was made to fulfil the 'obligations of duty' in the part quoted above. I offer no apology for approaching the consideration of the contents of the Proclamation from a lawyer's point of view and for using legal phraseology. It is a legal document and must be interpreted as such.

Now, gentlemen, who can say that the Indian people have not fulfilled their pledge of allegiance both by word and deed. Need I remind, on your behalf, those who are apt to forget our magnificent—I was almost going to say, our momentous - fulfilment of this pledge when England was fighting the Great War on the battlefields of Europe, Arabia, Mesopotamia and Egypt in 1914-18, on an issue which was wholly foreign to our own interest?

The Congress and Sir Syed Ahmad

The period which immediately followed the Proclamation was a period of deep demoralization and despondency for the Muslims of India. The Mutiny cut them adrift from their old moorings. economic and political. This feeling of despondency was aggravated by the fact that they found themselves wholly unprepared to take their rightful place in the new dispensations and adjustments which were rapidly coming into existence as a result of the impact between the Western and Eastern ideals, political and social institutions. After some controversy, the foundations of Engish Education in India were laid in 1833. While the Musalmans of India still possessed their great heritage, the Empire of India, though only nominally, and

to inculcate into the minds of the younger generations of the Muslims of India, Western ideals of life and government. What those ideals were according to him can be gathered from his *Safarnama-i-Englistan*, which he wrote in the year 1869, while he was staying in London. They were above all 'patriotism and liberty of thought'. Obviously the object which Sir Syed had in view could not be achieved except through the education of Muslim youths in the English language and on Western lines. On his return from Europe, he first opened a school at Aligarh in May 1875, which was raised to the status of a college within two years.

Scarcely eight years had elapsed when the foundations of the Indian National Congress were laid in Bombay as described above. Sir Syed Ahmad correctly gauged the situation in which the Musalmans of India stood in the year 1885. He found that they were not prepared to take part in the active politics of the country, according to the standard laid down by the Congress. The generation which has passed, since has repeatedly affirmed the accuracy of the diagnosis Sir Syed Ahmad made of the conditions and the circumstances then existing in India in relation to the Musalmans. Those circumstances and conditions were mainly these :

1. The Musalmans had not had enough time to prepare themselves to fit in with the new order of things and adjustments proposed by the Indian National Congress.

2. The disastrous results of the economic condition of the Musalmans of India brought about by the Mutiny of 30 years ago.

3. What might be a politically organized agitation for Hindus was likely to turn into another rebellion when applied to the Musalmans.

4. An assiduously nurtured suspicion and distrust of the Musalmans of India by the British people.

These were the causes which impelled Sir Syed Ahmad to advise the Musalmans of India against participation in the Congress movement. I very strongly repudiate the suggestion that Sir Syed Ahmad was supposed to self-government in the country, or that he was less patriotic in his ideals than the greatest patriot amongst and other section of the people. Five years before his famous speech of December 28, 1887, at Lucknow, he had delivered a speech in the Viceroy's Legislative Council in support of representative institutions as an ideal. But he had advised the introduction of such institutions into this country to be postponed until every section of the people of the country had attained equality in education *and achieved as one nation.* It is impossible to deny the truth and the wisdom of these words. At least it will be agreed that December 1887 marks the dawn of political consciousness among the Musalmans of India.

Muslims Enter Politics

The next active step in their political life was taken by the Musalmans of India under the leadership of Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk at Lucknow in October 1901. An institution with the name of Muslim Political Association was started. A programme of work was prepared; and expression was given to the view that having regard to the conditions then existing, it was not desirable to co-operate with the Indian National Congress in its political activities; that such a co-operation would be more injurious than advantageous to the political life of the Indian Musalmans as a corporate body. The scheme proposed by Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk was that a Muslim political association should be organized and constituted in every village, and a district association in every district, and a provincial association in every province, and that the association then founded should be an All-India association. Efforts were made to institute such an association. Then came the famous deputation of Muslims to Lord Minto, under the leadership of His Highness the Agha Khan, on October 1, 1906. In this Deputation both Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk took active part. The next step after this was the

laying of the foundation of the All-India Muslim League at Dacca in December 1906. It is very interesting reading to trace the development of political thought and gradual widening of political ideals amongst the Musalmans of India in the speeches and writings of that veteran leader of the Muslims, *viz.* Nawab Viqar-ul Mulk. In December 1912, the All-India Muslim League altered its Constitution by declaring that the foremost object of the League was the attainment of self-government suited to India. The present Constitution describes the same object in the following words : "Attainment of full responsible government for India, by all peaceful and legitimate means, with adequate and effective safeguards for Musalmans."

It was only six years before this momentous change in the Constitution of the All-India Muslim League that the Congress had expressed the opinion that the system of government obtaining in the self-governing Dominions should be extended to India. The Musalmans of India, therefore, were not much behind the Congress politicians in laying down self-government as the goal of our country's political development.

It will be seen that at the Congress Session held at Bombay in 1915, the Constitution was radically altered and the doors of entry into the fold of the Congress were thrown open to representatives of any association which had as one of its objects "the attainment of self-government within the British Empire by constitutional means". Thus the goal of both these political associations, the All-India National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, was defined in practically the same language. At the same Session of the Congress, a resolution was passed instructing the All-India Congress Committee to confer with the executive of the Muslim League and frame a scheme of self-government. This, as you are all aware, culminated in the Lucknow Pact of 1916. The Pact must go down in Indian history as a great landmark in the political evolution of the country, as a signal proof of identity of purpose and earnestness of co-operation between the two great sections of the people of India in the task of the

attainment of responsible government. However, it soon became evident that the Lucknow Pact was not the last word on the question of adjustment of political differences between the Hindus and the Musalmans; nor in the new circumstances that had arisen could the Pact be treated as final. This attitude towards the Pact led to the formation of a committee to prepare a Draft Constitution for India. Out of the deliberations of this Committee emerged the Nehru Report.

In December 1928, the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League both held their sessions in the city of Calcutta and the consideration of the Nehru Report engaged the attention of both the bodies. At the same time was convened what was called the National convention.

The controversy in the Congress over the Nehru Report centred on two points: Firstly, whether the goal of political movement was to be Dominion Status as proposed in the Nehru Report or complete independence. The latter expression when used in juxtaposition to the former signified severence from the British Empire. The second point was the consideration of the issue of joint or separate electorates for the minorities, particularly in relation to the Muslims of India.

The Muslim League sent its representatives to the Congress to state its case. Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah was chosen as the spokesman. Mr. Jinnah expressed the willingness of the Muslim League to accept joint electorates subject to certain conditions. He stated those conditions. The amendment thus moved by Mr. Jinnah, on behalf of the All-India Muslim League, to the proposal of joint electorates made in the Nehru Report was summarily rejected by the Congress. So, once more, Mr. Jinnah's efforts in the direction of an agreed settlement of this issue were thwarted. In my opinion this attitude of the Congress produced disastrous effects in the constitutional advancement of the country. Let us all hope that such effects were transitory, and that a *via media* may still be found for an amicable settlement between the two parties. It may be useful to remember the efforts of Mr. Jinnah, on

our behalf, in the same direction in preceding years. While these momentous events were happening in Calcutta, a meeting of some prominent Muslim leaders of India was held at Delhi on December 31, 1928. As a result of the deliberations of the meeting the Muslim All-Parties Conference was formed and opened by His Highness the Aga Khan. The Conference could not have been opened under better auspices. My friend, Sir Mohammad Yaqub, speaking on the occasion, recalled that the deputation which waited on Lord Minto in 1906 and which resulted in the formation of separate electorates was headed by His Highness the Aga Khan, and that it was most fortunate that now when the question of separate electorates was being re-examined, they should have the services of "the same gardener who first sowed the seed." My friend, Sir Mohammad Yaqub, truly observed further that there was no person in India except His Highness the Aga Khan who could make all the parties unite on one platform.

It is quite clear to me that the direct and immediate cause of the Conference having been brought into existence was the proposal of the Nehru Report to establish joint electorates under the new Constitution of India. The Conference dispersed after passing one single resolution demanding Muslim representation in the various legislatures and other statutory self-governing bodies through separate electorates, also laying down the percentage of such representation and asking for the introduction of constitutional reforms in the North-Western Frontier Province and Baluchistan.

The sequence of events at the Calcutta meetings clearly leads us to the inference that the need for a separate political organization would have been altogether avoided if the convenors of the conference had waited only a day longer to hear the results which attended the endeavours of the All-India Muslim League to reach an agreed solution. Anyway, the conference has served its purpose; and now that only a few days ago, again under the presidentship of His Highness the Agha Khan, it declared its object to be the attainment of Dominion Status for India, the region for its separate existence has vanished. I

deprecate all such utterances whereby it is said, either expressly or impliedly that the convenors of the conference were actuated by selfish motives. They were all men full of genuine patriotic fervour, and they sincerely desired to save the Musalmans of India, according to their lights, from committing political suicide. We may or may not agree with their views; but at all events, there is no occasion left now for agreement or disagreement on the comparative merits of the forms of electorates—separate or joint. The statutory provisions made in this behalf in the Government of India Act, must stand *pro prio vigore* until replaced by new provisions made by Parliament. It is also clear that Parliament will not interfere with the existing provisions unless and until the parties concerned produce an agreed settlement as a substitute thereof.

In these circumstances I appeal to all Musalmans, and particularly to the members of the Muslim Conference, to consider seriously the question of amalgamating the two organizations. I make this appeal in full trust and confidence that the desired fusion of the two bodies will soon be a *fait accompli*.

The All-India Muslim League and the All-India Muslim Conference again met at Simla in August 1934, and both passed resolutions condemning efforts to upset the Award which, of course, was not incorporated in the Constitution Act till then; even the Bill embodying the proposed Constitution had not been placed before Parliament; but since then, as pointed out above, the Award has been put on the statute-book. The question, therefore, is set at rest and is no longer a live issue. This, however, must not be taken to mean that the door for an amicable settlement is closed for ever.

I feel that I cannot leave the question of the Award without expressing my sense of deep pain at the attitude which the Congress adopted towards it.

On June 17, 1934, the Working Committee recorded the declaration of the Congress policy in respect of the Award. The declaration stated that, "Since, however, the different

communities in the country are sharply divided on the question of the Communal Award, it is necessary to define the Congress attitude towards it. The Congress claims to represent equally all the communities composing the Indian nation. Therefore, in view of the division of opinion, it can neither accept nor reject the Communal Award as long as the division of opinion lasts." This declaration was afirmed by the Indian National Congress at Bombay in October 1934. It will be recalled that Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya had moved an amendment, the substance of which was the substitution of the rejection of the Award instead of the clause, "neither accepting nor rejecting it." It will also be recalled that Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya started a new organization called the Congress Nationalists Party, and has since been carrying on a vigorous propaganda against the Award. Thus the attitude adopted by the Congress had the double effect of the secession from the Congress of the Anti-Award Group and creating a feeling in the minds of the Musalmans that the Congress was not prepared to co-operate with them in the struggle to free the country from the yoke of foreign domination. The truth of the old saying that by trying to please all you please none was once more established.

The Congress in 1928 had failed to rise to the occasion when it rejected Mr. Jinnah's offer of joint electorates subject to certain conditions, and the Congress did the same in 1934. The Congress failed to realize the far-reaching consequences of its policy of neutrality in the matter of the Award. To my mind this policy has made it more difficult to work out a programme of united and concerted action for the attainment of self-government for our country.

Political problems cannot be solved by attempts at phrase-making, however brilliant a piece of intellectual gymnastics the phrase may appear to be.

Now, who can doubt that Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya is the sincerest of patriots ? Who can deny his great sacrifices in the cause of the political advancement of our country, and who can withhold his tribute of respect and admiration for his life-long services to his nation ? I am convinced, gentleman,

and I want you to bear the same conviction, that his difference with some of us on the question of joint versus separate electorates is honest, and the result of a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances which effect the task of nation-building. I will revert to the subject hereafter. But I appeal to him, on your behalf and on behalf of myself, that he may consider the advisibility of approaching this vexed question from the point of view of endeavouring to bring about a settlement between the opinions, and not by an agitation, directed against the Parliament, so to amend the Constitution Act as to eliminate such provisions of the Act as are contained in what is called the Award. I extend this appeal to all other leaders of Hindu opinion who, it must be acknowledged, are sincere and selfless workers in the cause of India's political status.

Reverting to the meetings of the Muslim Conference, I must now mention another resolution which the conference passed as regards representation of the Musalmans in the Central and Provincial services of the country. Here I wish to record my emphatic protest against the contemptuous attitude, with which my Hindu brethren dismiss this question as unworthy of any consideration. The insistence on the part of the Muslims for a settlement of their rights in the services of the country must not be construed as a desire to secure an ascertained share in the dignity and the honour of an office. To my mind the problem is purely economic, and its acuteness is very much aggravated by the extent of unemployment, particularly among the educated classes of this country. Is not Government service looked upon in India as one of the principal means of livelihood ? Has not the Government so far taken no steps whatsoever to solve the problem of unemployment ? The reception which the Government of the United Provinces gave to the Sapru Committee Report on unemployment does not inspire us with much confidence.

The question of services still awaits a settlement and it is desirable, in the higher interest of the country, that the settlement of this question should be an agreed settlement.

The Question of Indian Freedom

Now, gentlemen, I have already shown that the ultimate object of the constitutional advancement of the Muslims of India, as represented by their several political organizations, is the attainment of responsible government for our motherland, and I have also shown that in its essentials the object of the Indian National Congress is the same; and there is no question that the object of various other political organizations in the country is the same, including the two new organizations of landholders of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. It will serve no useful purpose to enter into any discussion as to the precise connotations of several words and phrases that have been used by politicians of our country, Hindus and Muslims, in this connection—such words and phrases as '*swaraj*,' '*purna swaraj*,' 'self-government', 'complete independence', 'responsible government', 'substance of independence', and 'Dominion Status'. For all practical purposes they must be taken to signify government of the country through legislatures elected on a broad-based franchise, if not full adult suffrage. It must be further laid down as a postulate that such government must be under the aegis not of the British Crown, but of the Crown of the Emperor of India. Our allegiance to the Crown, whenever tested, has always been found to be firm and strong, and it bore no greater strain than it did during recent years. Temples and mosques were demolished, indiscriminate shooting and *lathi* charges were resorted to; our leaders of the movement for freedom were incarcerated; our people were sent to jail without a judicial trial; restraints were placed on the movements of our people on bare suspicions; freedom of speech and press was smothered; ordinances were promulgated and repressive laws were passed in abundance. Indeed, one can safely say that on the statute-books of India hardly any margin is left for the loyalty to the Crown to be written upon. Yet the people of India did not break their allegiance either in action or in words. One might ask, why? The answer is two fold: It is to the interest of India, I will not say to remain a self-governing member of the British Commonwealth, because

I do not like the description at all—nor does the description suit the actual and real Indian conditions—but because, having regard to the worldwide struggle and the policy of imperialist aggression, no nation can exist in isolation and the Crown is the link between the British and the Indian nations. All we want is an equality of status between these two nations. And this gentlemen, as I have already shown, was promised to us by Her Most Gracious Majesty, the late Queen Victoria, as early as 1858.

It is said by British statesmen that they are putting us on the road to responsible government; but that they cannot enact a Constitution for complete responsible government, because we are not yet fit to assume this responsibility, and we are likely to commit blunders which will bring disasters in their train. The answer to this is that the charge is untrue, and that they and the whole world know that it is untrue. But even if it is true, does it not imply an admission on their part that their rule over India has been a dismal failure, and that they have been ruling this country in their own interest and not in the interest of the Indian people ?

A word or two about the danger of disastrous consequences of the government of India by the people of India. It seems to me that the British nation, or at least the British Parliament, should be the last to make this assertion. It is significant that such disastrous blunders have been committed by the British Parliament mostly in relation to the political freedom of other people; and my fear is that unless the destinies of our people are placed into their own hands soon, history will have to record another instance of a 'disastrous blunder' on the part of the British Parliament. Britain lost her American colonies in consequence of a blunder; Britain was on the verge of losing Canada altogether when it was saved a self-governing Dominion by Lord Durham. The case of Ireland is parallel to the case of India. In one respect, the latter's case is stronger. In the case of Ireland, successive Home Rule Bills were introduced by Gladstone, but the British Parliament refused to accept them. Parnell was an

Irishman, but he was also a member of the British Parliament. He pinned his faith on constitutional agitation and constitutional remedies. He, too, failed. The disaster which resulted from the failure of Gladstone, Parnell and many other Irish patriots make a gruesome tale; and I have no desire to excite your emotions. I therefore should not say more. Does it, therefore, lie in the mouth of British Parliament and the people of Britain to fling in our face imaginary dangers as a ground for withholding responsible government from India.

There is only one more matter which I wish to emphasize here. It should always be borne in mind that India is a continent; it should further be borne in mind that the Hindus and the Musalmans inhabiting this vast continent are not two communities, but should be considered two nations in many respects. So that when the British Parliament is withholding the inauguration of full responsible government in this country, it is resisting two great nations of the world and not only two communities. To describe them, for political purposes, as two communities is really creating an illusion. Are not the Hindus of to-day the inheritors of a glorious heritage of civilization, culture, literature, philosophy, and even a lost empire ? Even to-day there are Hindu Princes who are possessed of kingdoms of vast areas and large populations. Then again look to their numbers, and compare them with any other group of people in Europe. What I have said of the Hindus can be said of the Musalmans also. Therefore, when you are differentiating these two people as an argument against the grant of responsible government to India, you are creating a difference to further your own interests. The two peoples described above form one greater Indian nation, and I have made it clear that the greater Indian nation is of one voice in its claim for self-government for her common motherland.

When the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms were being introduced, we wanted some time limit to be fixed on the expiration of which full responsible government might become the constitution of the Indian Government. The British

Parliament and the British people refused to fix any time limit. Now this absence of a time limit in those reforms may mean one of the two things : (i) that the introduction of responsible government was being deferred till the end of time, or (2) that it will come after the lapse of a reasonable time.

I do not think Parliament would very much cherish the first interpretation to be placed on the omission of a time limit in the Constitution of those days; thus we are left with the second interpretation alone. We claim that a period of 16 years is a reasonable time; but still the new Constitution is neither giving us responsible government nor again fixing a time limit for the same.

The New Constitution

The worst feature of the new Constitution is that it has not got in itself the seeds of growth. There are no stages of development prescribed by the Constitution which may lead us finally to full responsible government. This brings me to the consideration of the Government of India Act, 1935. The subject has been thrashed thread-bare, and I propose to say very little in this connection.

Now, this Constitution has been 'rejected' by one section of the Indian people. (I am using the word 'rejected' because it has been used by that section.) On the other hand, it has been 'accepted' by another section of our people. (I am again repeating the word 'accepted'). But all sections of Indians are unanimous in condemning it as 'unsatisfactory'. Indeed, it has been said that it is worse than the existing Constitution. Again, there is difference of opinion on the question whether it should be worked or should be wrecked. Excepting the Jamiatul-ulema, all Muslim organizations have declared in favour of the former view.

I do not share the view that it is worse than the existing Constitution. In my opinion the Constitution of 1935 provides much larger scope and gives more powers to our ministers to carry out beneficent reforms in almost all the nation-building

departments. They will not be hampered by the finance committees, having on their personnel non-elected and official members; and the Governor of a Province will hesitate much before interfering with the proposals of his ministers, so long as they do not materially affect law and order and the special interests of the European group. But this is all that can be said in favour of the new Constitution.

In empowers the Governor of a Province to issue ordinances, which, of course, in the absence of such a power, would have been issued by the Governor-General at the desire of a Governor. It also authorizes the Governor to pass Bills drawn up by himself into laws as legislative enactments.

These powers are in addition to the powers of acting "in his discretion" and exercising his "individual judgement". The scope of the exercise of the power last mentioned is left undefined and is, therefore, unlimited. This, to my mind, is perfectly clear from the provisions of Section 50 of the Government of India Act, 1935. Section 52 merely states cases in which the Governor is laid under an obligation to exercise his "functions of special responsibilities". In other cases, his discretion is left unfettered as to whether he will or will not exercise his "individual judgement" (*vide* Sub-section 3, Section 50). Section 52 lays down seven cases in which the Governor must act according to his "individual judgement". We are directly concerned with four of them, which are as follows :

(a) the prevention of any grave menace to the peace or tranquillity of the province or any part thereof;

(b) the safeguarding of the legitimate interests of minorities;

(c) the securing to, and to the dependents of, persons who are or have been members of the public services of any rights provided or preserved for them by or under this Act, and the safeguarding of their legitimate interests;

(d) the securing in the sphere or executive action of the purposes which the provisions of Chapter III of Part V of this Act are designed to secure in relation to legislation.

Clause (d) may be disposed of first. Chapter III of Part V relates to legal rights of British subjects domiciled in the United Kingdom and British companies and vessels incorporated in the United Kingdom. The substance of that part of the statute is that the British subjects domiciled in the United Kingdom and British companies and vessels incorporated therein are given all the rights which they possess under the laws of the United Kingdom and, in addition, all the rights which may be possessed by a British Indian under the federal or provincial laws of British India. Clause (d) empowers the Governor with executive authority to give effect to the provisions made by Chapter III, Part V of the Act.

Now, gentlemen, I have not much quarrel with those provisions of law which are known as 'safeguards' on their own merits. Broadly speaking, perhaps they are necessary as safeguards are necessary in every Constitution, whether imposed by a convention or by a statute. My main objection, however, is that they are left to be applied or not to be applied according to the "individual judgement" of the Governor of the Province and his discretion may be exercised wholly arbitrarily. Take the case of clause (a). It will be wholly within his powers to convert an ordinary riot into ag reat "menace to the peace and tranquillity of the province". Mark the use of the word "tranquillity". Any zealous demonstration of religious feeling at a festival can come within the scope of the clause. When you come to clause (b), you have the expression "legitimate interests". Here again the determination as to what are and what are not legitimate interests is left entirely to the individual judgement of the Governor; and you may rest assured that except in the case of a European minority the Governor will always try, as he ought to, to avert a clash with the Ministrv under this Act. Thus there is no safeguard against an aggressive minister or even a meek minister. The same

Act. It is anti-democratic, it will strengthen all the most reactionary elements in the country, and instead of helping us to develop on progressive lines, it will enchain and crush the forces working for democracy and freedom. The Muslim classes, the Muslim masses will suffer from the new scheme as much as any other section of the Indian people. Let me remind the Muslims of India that, of the demands put forward on their behalf before the Round-Table Conference, not many have been conceded. True, we got the separation of Sind; we got separate electorates; we got a bare majority in the Punjab; but we also demanded "the safeguarding of essential and vital interests of Muslims; a statutory guarantee of Muslim representation in various services; vesting of residuary powers in the provinces; representation of Muslims in the Central and Provincial cabinets by those commanding the greatest Muslim following in the legislatures, ...and reforms for Baluchistan" (*vide* the resolution of the All-India Muslim Conference, February 15, 1934). All this we did not get. In Bengal our majority has been sacrificed to protect the interests of the reactionary European merchant class—a class which is loyal to everything else except the land which gives them enormous wealth. The demands conceded and the demands rejected were parts of an integral whole; when one part is granted and the other rejected, the value and the utility of the former is highly diminished, if not altogether lost. The result is that we all got the whole of the shadow, and none got even a fragment of the substance. We demanded political power and political freedom. The Muslim asked for the same,albeit with certain safeguards. This has clearly been denied to India. This, gentlemen, is the true and real character of the Constitution Act.

Need for a New Outlook

If to-day we find Sir Syed Ahmad's idea lincomplete and insufficient for the Muslims of India, it is because the whole development of events—political, social and economic in this country and in the rest of the world, has been due to causes and on lines which did not exist and which do not correspond

to the conditions prevailing in the second half of the nineteenth century.

New problems have arisen to-day. It is not only a question of educating the middle class of the Muslims in India on Western lines and providing them with jobs; it is not only a question of infusing in them the ideal of Victorian liberalism. On the contrary, the present conditions compel us to go much deeper into the problems of the entire social regeneration of 70 million Muslims; of extricating them from the terrible poverty, degradation and backwardness into which they have fallen, giving them at least the rudiments of a civilized existence, and making them free citizens of a free land. We must realize, as people of other countries have realized, that a change is necessary, and that unless such a change is soon made, the whole of this social structure must come down with a crash, which will involve the extinction of not only the educated section of our people, but also of all privileged classes, whether they hold privileges by reason of caste, land or money. The foundations of the superstructure in which we are living to-day were laid centuries ago, and it is but natural that those foundations have ceased to be stable now. It is the duty—if it is not only an obligation created by motives of self-interest—of all of us, the educated classes, the capitalists, the land-holders, to combine together to lay the foundations of a new structure. Of course, in order that effort might fructify, sacrifices will have to be made on the part of all. Let me tell you that the building of such a social edifice will be more glorious, more humane and more just than the building of an empire. The question that now arises is how to create conditions which will favour the performance of this duty, and how to remove the obstacles from our path of progress in this direction. The existing system on which the government of our country is carried on is not only insufficient for our purposes, but is positively obstructive. Consider the paltry sums of money which are doled out for rural up-lift, for unemployment; and remember that even those sums are derived from revenues raised by fresh and oppressive taxation. Consider also the slow pace at which Indianization of the services is

being effected. The financial and economic policy of the Government is draining the already poverty-stricken country of its wealth, and wasting and mis-spending its resources. Parenthetically, I may express the hope that our new ministers will not launch projects of building more New Delhis, more Council Chambers and Back Bays. The details are too painful to describe. I pause here to observe that the continued existence of this deplorable state of affairs is wholly inconsistent with and a complete negation of the culture and traditions of Islam, which were essentially based upon democratic fraternity.

The answer to the question formulated above indeed emerges from the very narration of the facts which I have briefly made in the preceding paragraphs, and it is this, that we must have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and that soon.

The next question is how to get it? So far as the working of the new Constitution is concerned, you have already decided to work it. I also do not believe that it is possible to wreck it, if by wrecking we simply mean creating deadlocks in the Legislature. Ample provisions have been made in the Constitution to meet that contingency; and I fail to see how we can profit by creating that situation. It is also obvious that just by working the Constitution we are not brought nearer to responsible government even by an inch. Therefore, something has to be done soon to attain political freedom. We are frequently told that our ideals must be cherished for all time to come as mere incentives to progress. We are told that these sweet dreams will save us from total annihilation. We are advised to wait with suspended breath for the automatic realization of our ideals.

Gentlemen, I am convinced that all this is said with the best of intentions and with an eye to serving the best interests of Muslim India; but I am equally convinced that those who tender such advice, either deliberately or unwittingly forget the moral forces which have been let loose all the world over

in modern times, in particular since the Great War. It is true that there are certain ideals which must always remain only ideals, such as the millennium and *Ramraj*. But surely, gentlemen, those are not and never have been the ideals of statesmen, or at least of sensible statesmne. Their ideals are always capable of being realized in as short a time as possible. Is our ideal of responsible government to be classed amongst the former or the latter ? I leave it to you to answer this question. As regards the time-old policy of 'wait and see', I say that it is a counsel of despair and an acknowledgement of defeat. We cannot possibly accept this policy. Now what are the realities ? The forces which I have briefly mentioned above are working at great speed. This cannot be denied. Let us therefore set our house in order as quickly as possible if we want to avert a disaster. It should be remembered that these forces are not expected to regulate their pace according to a time-table which we may choose to prescribe. I wish to hasten the inauguration of self-government in the interests of peace and order and of the well being of all. I would have advised you to wait if I were certain that we would have responsible government within a reasonable time. No signs of conciliation or even of relaxing the stiff attitude of the British Parliament in this behalf is discernible. The new Act has done away with the preamble in the old Act, and Parliament has refused to use the expression 'Dominion Status' or an equivalent of it in the statute. Very learned and elaborate arguments have been put forward in the House of Commons for these omissions. The arguments may be perfectly sound but what is the inference ? I will leave it to you to draw your own conclusion. Again we asked for bread and got a stone. Now gentlemen, the past history of the British domination of India and the recent events, which it is not possible to state here in detail, all prove conclusively that the British people certainly treat our ideal of self-government as a distant millennium which may never become a reality.

Under these circumstances can anybody honestly blame us of impatience. Have we not waited with serene composure and patience for over a century, indeed since the commence-

ment of the British connection with India ?

Roads to Freedom

We must therefore devise ways and means to hasten the achievement of our goal. For this there are three well-defined ways, one of which we must adopt : (1) armed revolution, (2) non-co-operation and civil disobedience, and (3) progress on constitutional lines. If armed revolution succeeds, it must follow that our connection with the Crown or the Emperor of India must also be broken, and I have said already that this would be detrimental to our broader national interest. An armed revolution in India would never succeed, and an unsuccessful revolution would mean a great calamity for the Indian people. We also cannot organize such a revolution in this vast country.

The way of non-co-operation and civil disobedience has been tried and found wanting. It has no precedent in history, and it will certainly not appeal to the Musalmans of India. It is said, on the one hand, that our resorting to non-co-operation and civil disobedience in the past years has at least resulted in bringing a reformed Constitution into existence; but it is also said, on the other hand, that these movements set the hands of the clock back, and that we would have got a better Constitution if these movements had notcome in to existence. It is not necessary to decide between these two claims. One result, however, is indisputable. These movements have brought a crop of repressive ordinances and laws in their train which are still on the statute-books. It is also clear that those in power are not willing to yield to such moral influences alone. Srijut Babu Rajendra Prasad, in his Presidential Address at the last session of the All-India National Congress, said, "To my mind Truth, Non-violence and *Khadi* represent a triple force whereby we can achieve the whole of the Karachi programme and more...I would say emphatically that we should do nothing that compromises by one iota the creed of non-violence." Addressing the socialists he said, "my friends, the socialists are keen on a more inspiring ideology and would

hasten the elimination of all that stands for exploitation. I should like to tell them in all humility, but with all the force at my command, that there is no greater ideology than is expressed by the creed of Truth and Non-violence and the determination of the country not to eliminate the men that stand for exploitation but the forces that do so. Our quarrel is with the sin and not the sinner which we all have to a greater or less degree. Compulsion will react on us with redoubled force; conversion, however slow it may seem, will be the shortest cut and will mean a new contribution to history and civilization."

Gentlemen, these are certainly the words of a saint, but it is equally certain that they are not the words of a political leader who wants his people to help in the most grim of all struggles, the struggle for freedom. Because some Americans and Frenchmen of kindred spirit have applauded the moral virtues of non-violent political movements, it will not, I am convinced, make them "a new contribution to history and civilization."

Gentlemen, we have no other choice left but to work on the lines of what is compendiously called 'constitutional agitation'. I confess that I am not particularly happy over the expression. Its meaning, however, is well understood. It has one great advantage, it can be pursued both inside and outside the legislatures, and should be pursued in both these spheres. But to be of any use, it must be effective, almost compelling in its result, and it cannot be so unless and until it is the voice and the act of a united India.

Gentlemen, it seems to me that the existing political circumstances of our country present no obstacle in effecting unity. The object of all political organizations—Hindu, Muslim and Agricultural—is avowedly the attainment of self-government for India. The question of separate and joint electorates has been set at rest, and we shall be well advised to leave it there. In the higher interests of the country, I appeal for unity not only between Hindus and Muslims as such, but also between the various classes and different political organizations.

Such a unity will not only make an ideal a reality, but it will also give an opportunity for political adjustment amongst all concerned. Even in the past there was no difference on essentials, and there is none now. The differences in detail have also ceased to exist. Is there any moral justification left for perpetuating differences when the supreme need of the country in its struggle for freedom is unity ? A united India will be a force to be reckoned with, not the helpless victim of callous and irresponsible government. The pressure which can be brought to bear on imperialism when we are united, when we have behind us the support of the entire Indian nation, will be irresistible in its momentum; then the voices of our leaders will not be compared to the barking of dogs by British statesmen; then it will be India which will dictate its terms to its adversaries. Is it asking too much that for the sake of our common interests, those interests on which depends the very existence of the Indian nation, we put in the background our differences, if any, and present a united front on all questions relating to India's freedom ?

Unity on a New Basis

This unity should not merely be an abstract and distant ideal. We must give it a concrete shape by organizing the broadest strata of the entire Indian people, Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Parsis and Christians, on the basis of a common programme of action. We should immediately set about, in co-operation with other progressive political parties in the country, to find such minimum measure of agreement as would enable us to act together. I suggest for your consideration the following programme of our immediate aims :

(1) A democratic responsible government, with adult franchise, to take the place of the present system.

(2) Repeal of all exceptionally repressive laws and the granting of the right of free speech, freedom of the press and organization.

(3) Immediate economic relief to the peasantry; State

provision for educated and uneducated unemployed; and an eight-hour working day, with fixed minimum wages for the workers.

(4) Introduction of free, compulsory primary education.

A programme of this nature will give us the opportunity to organize a nation-wide movement: it will arouse the political consciousness of millions of our countrymen; it will bring together the various communities and create a spirit of mutual confidence; and finally, it will bring such pressure on the Government that it cannot be ignored. Its inevitable consequence will be that we shall be brought nearer to our goal of freedom. The salvation of the Indian people can only come through their own united efforts. And there is no other method of creating this unity than action on the lines of a programme that cuts through our communal divisions and has an appeal, not only for the patriotic section of our upper classes, but for millions of our poorer countrymen.

A Call to Unity

I suggest that, in order to work out the details of this programme, a letter should be issued over the signatures of the permanent President of the League and of the Indian National Congress to all political organizations, consisting of Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs etc., alike, to attend a meeting at the earliest opportunity. This meeting may be called upon :

(a) to settle an annual programme of action, to be worked both inside and outside the new legislatures and local boards, and

(b) to draft a Constitution for India.

This body should also elect a permanent committee to see that agitation on the basis of the settled programme is carried through in the country as effectively as possible; to organize the electoral campaign; and generally to give a lead to the country on all important political issues which may arise from time to time.

Before I end, I must touch on the question of the reorganization of the Muslim League. I suggest that we should immediately undertake the formation of district branches of the League all over the country. A group of about 25 young Muslims should be enrolled to do this work in each province; and out of the members of the newly formed League branches should be formed Provincial Leagues in each province which, in their turn, should elect the delegates to the All-India body.

For all this money will be needed, and I want to make an earnest appeal to you to take up immediately the question of raising a fund of at least Rs 500,000. The League Council should work out the details for the collection of this fund. We should ask a group of ladies to makes a tour of the country to organize the League throughout the length and breadth of India and to collect the funds proposed above.

Gentlemen, we are face to face with great and momentous problems. Our proceedings are being watched with anxious interest, not only by the Musalmans of India, but by the entire Indian nation. Our decisions should give Muslim men and women a clear lead, so that they may take their fullest possible share in all our national activities.

I want to make a special reference to our women here. Their great and heroic qualities compel me to make a special appeal to them to take a greater share than they have so far done in the national movement. Muslim women in other parts of the world have obtained their emancipation and are participating in the public life of their respective countries. There is no reason why Indian Muslim women, together with the women of other communities, should not do the same.

Gentlemen, I want to finish my address on a note of hope. We have undoubtedly great and difficult tasks in front of us, but we have right on our side. With united and organized efforts, with faith, hope and determination in our hearts to lead us on, success will very soon be ours—*Amin, Allah-o-Akbar.*

10

PLIGHT OF THE MUSLIMS UNDER HINDU TYRANNY*

This session of the All-India Muslim League is one of the most critical that has ever taken place during its existence for more than the last thirty years.

The Policy and the Programme that you are calling upon to formulate and lay down involves the fate and the future of the Musalmans of India and the country at large. On April 12, 1936, the Muslim League at its Twenty Fourth Session, for the first time in its history, undertook a policy and programme of mass contact. The League considered the prevailing conditions, and surveyed the situation that we had to face in the forthcoming elections on the eve of the inauguration of the new Provincial Constitution embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935; and it had no alternative but to enter the field and contest the elections to the Provincial Legislatures. It was also felt that there was no alternative but to utilise the Provincial Constitution for what it was worth, although it was far from being satisfactory. I may here reproduce the resolution that was passed on April 12, 1936 :

> "Whereas the Parliamentary system of Government which is being introduced in this country, with the inauguration of the new Constitution, presupposes the formation of parties with a well-defined policy and programme which facilitate the education of the electorate and co-operation between groups with proximate aims and ideals, and ensures the working of the Constitution

---

* Presidential address delivered by M. A. Jinnah at the Lucknow Session held on 15-18 October, 1937.

to the best advantage; and whereas in order to strengthen the solidarity of the Muslim community and to secure for the Muslims their proper and effective share in the Provincial Governments, it is essential that the Muslims should organize themselves as one party, with an advanced and progressive programme, it is hereby resolved that the All-India Muslim League to take steps to contest the approaching Provincial Elections, and for this purpose appoint Mr. Jinnah to form a Central Election Board under his presidentship, consisting of not less than 35 members, with powers to constitute and affiliate Provincial Elections Boards in various Provinces, having regard to the condition of each province and devise ways and means for carrying out the aforesaid objects.

Muslim League Boards and Elections

In pursuance of that decision, the Muslim League Central Parliamentary Board was established in June, 1936, and Provincial Boards were also established in various provinces, to give effect to the resolution and the instructions of the League. This was not done without difficulty; and it was no small task to be performed, in the absence of any previous preparations or any existing sufficient organization and machinery. It was a stupendous undertaking to contest elections in all the provinces, specially as Musalmans all over India are numerically in a minority and weak, educationally backward, and economically nowhere. Never had any systematic effort been made for their social and economic uplift; whereas our sister communities have gone far ahead with their organizations and their systematic programmes supported by a large bulk of people—especially the Hindus, who are not only in a majority, but better trained, more disciplined and far better equipped educationally, economically and financially.

But here I may mention that, within a short time of about six months' work, before the elections were over, the

results were very hopeful, and there is no need for us to despair. In each and every province where a League Parliamentary Board was established and League parties were constituted, we carried away about 60 to 70 per cent of the seats that were contested by the League candidates; and since the elections, I find that hundreds of District Leagues have been established in almost every province, from the farthest corner of Madras to the North-West Frontier Province. Since April last, the Musalmans of India have rallied round the League more and more; and I feel confident that once they round understand and realize the policy and programme of the Muslim League, the entire Musalman population of India will rally round its platform and under its flag. The Muslim League stands for full national democratic self-government for India.

Words and Deeds

A great deal of capital is made out of phrases for the consumption of the ignorant and illiterate masses. Various phrases are used such as *Purna Swaraj*, self-government, complete independence, responsible government, substance of independence and dominion status. There are some who talk of complete independence. But it is no use having complete independence on your lips and the Government of India Act, 1935, in your hands. Those who talk of complete independence they must mean the least of what it means. Was the Gandhi-Irwin pact in consonance with complete independence? Were the assurances that were required before the offices could be accepted and the Provincial Constitutions could be worked in a way consistent with *Purna Swaraj*, and was the resolution, after the assurances were refused, accepting offices and working the Provincial Constitution enacted by the British Parliament, and forced upon the people of India by imperialistic power, in keeping with the policy and programme and the declarations of the Congress party? Does wrecking mean working? These paper declarations, slogans and shibboleths are not going to carry us anywhere. What India requires is a completely united front and honesty of purpose, and then by whatever name you may call your government is a matter of no consequence so

long as it is a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

The Congress Attitude

The present leadership of the Congress, especially during the last 10 years, has been responsible for alienating the Musalmans of India more and more, by pursuing a policy which is exclusively Hindu; and since they have formed Governments in the six provinces where they are in a majority, they have by their words, deeds and programme shown, more and more, that the Musalmans cannot expect any justice or fairplay at their hands. Wherever they were in a majority and wherever it suited them, they refused to co-operate with the Muslim League parties and demanded unconditional surrender and the signing of their pledges.

The demand was insistent : abjure your partv and foreswear your policy and programme, and liquidate the Muslim League; but where they found that they did not have a majority, as in the North-West-Frontier Province, their sacred principle of collective responsibility disappeared, and promptly the Congress party in the Province was allowed to coalesce with any other group. Any individual Musalman member who was willing to unconditionally surrender and sign their pledge was offered a job as a minister, and was passed off as a Musalman minister, although he did not command the confidence or the respect of an over-whelming majority of the Musalman representatives in the legislatures. These men are allowed to move about and pass off as Muslim ministers for the 'loyal' services they have rendered to the Congress by surrendering and signing the pledge unconditionally; and the degree of their reward is the extent of their perfidy. Hindi is to be the national language of all India and the *Bande Mataram* is to be the national song, and is to be forced upon all. The Congress Flag is to be obeyed and revered by all and sundry. On the very threshold of what little power and responsibility is given, the majority community have clearly shown their hand : that

Hindustan is for the Hindus. Only the Congress masquerades under the name of nationalism, whereas the Hindu Mahasabha does not mince words. The result of the present Congress Party policy will be, I venture to say, class bitterness, communal war and a strengthening of the imperialistic hold as a consequence. I dare say that the British Government will give the Congress a free hand in this direction, and it matters very little to them—nay, on the contrary, it is all to the good, so long as their interests, Imperial or otherwise, are not touched and the defence remains intact—but I feel that a fearful reaction will set in when the Congress has created more and more divisions amongst Indians themselves, and made a united front impossible.

Here it will not be out of place to state that the responsibily of the British Government is no less in the disastrous consequences which may ensue. It has been clearly demonstrated that the governor and the Governor-General who have been given the powers, and special responsibility, to safeguard and protect the minorities under the Constitution which was made so much of by Lord Zetland, the Secretary of State for India, during the controversy of the assurances demanded by the Congress Party, have failed to use them, and have thereby been a party to the flagrant breach of the spirit of the Constitution and the instrument of instructions in the matter of the appointment of Muslim ministers. On the contrary, they have been a party to passing off men as Muslim ministers by appointing them as such, although they know full well that they do not command the confidence of the Muslim representatives or the public outside. If in a matter like this, the Governors have shown their utter helplessness and disregard for their sacred obligations, which were assumed by the British Government for the protection of minorities, could they, or would they, be able to afford protection in a hundred and one other matters which may not come up to the surface to be known in the day-to-day working of the Legislature and the administrative machinery ? These are very serious and noteworthy signs of the times. The one wholesome lesson that I ask the Musalmans to learn, before it is too late, is that the

path before the Musalmans is therefore plain. They must realize that the time has come when they should concentrate and devote their energies to self-organization and the full development of their power, to the exclusion of every other consideration. I have pointed out before that a section of the Musalmans is divided, that there is a group that stands with its face turned towards the British. If they have not learnt by now of the bitter consequences, they will never learn. God only helps those who help themselves. There is another group which turns towards the Congress; and they do so because they have lost faith in themselves. I want the Musalmans to believe in themselves and take their destiny in their own hands. We want men of faith and resolution who have courage and determination, and who would fight single handed for their convictions, although at the moment the whole world may be against them. We must develop power and strength till the Musalmans are fully organized, and have acquired that power and strength which must come from the solidarity and the unity of people.

No settlement with the majority is possible, as no Hindu leader speaking with any authority shows any concern or genuine desire for it. An honourable settlement can only be achieved between equals; and unless the two parties learn to respect and fear each other, there is no solid ground for any settlement. Offers of peace by the weaker party always mean a confession of weakness, and an invitation to aggression. Appeals to patriotism, justice and fairplay and for goodwill fall flat. It does not require political wisdom to realize that all safeguards and settlements would be a scrap of paper unless they were backed up by power. Politics means power and not relying only on cries of justice or fairplay or goodwill. Look at the nations of the world, and look at what is happening every day. See what has happened to Abyssinia; look at what is happening to China and Spain—not to speak of the tragedy of Palestine, to which I shall refer later.

The Congress High Command speaks in different voices. One opinion is that there is no such thing as a Hindu-Muslim

question, and no such thing as a minorities' question in the country. The other high opinion is that if a few crumbs were thrown to the Musalmans in their present disorganized and helpless state, you could manage them. They are sadly mistaken if they think that the Musalmans can be imposed upon. The All-India Muslim League has now come to live and play its just part in the world of Indian politics; and the sooner this is realized and reckoned with, the better it will be for all interests concerned. The third opinion is that there is no light to be seen through the impenetrable darkness; but as the Congress goes on acquiring strength and power, so the past promises of the blank cheques remain unfilled and unsigned.

I want the Musalmans to ponder over the situation and decide their own fate by having one single, definite, uniform policy which should be loyally followed throughout India. The Congressite Musalmans are making a great mistake when they preach unconditional surrender. It is the height of a defeatist mentality to throw ourselves on the mercy and goodwill of others, and the highest act of perfidy to the Musalman community; and if that policy is adopted, let me tell you, the community will seal its doom and cease to play its rightful part in the national life of the country and the Government. Only one thing can save the Musalmans and energize them to regain their lost ground. They must first recapture their own souls and stand by their lofty position and principles, which form the basis of their great unity and which bind them in one body politic. Do not be disturbed by the slogans and such taunts as are used against the Musalmans, 'communalists', 'toadies' and 'reactionaries'. The worst "toady" on earth, the most wicked communalist to-day amongst Muslims, when he surrenders unconditionally to the Congress and abuses his own community, becomes the nationalist of nationalists to-morrow! These terms and words of abuse are intended to create an inferiority complex amongst the Musalmans, and to demoralize them; and are intended to sow discord in our midst and give us a bad name in the world abroad. This is the standard of a propaganda which can only be treated with

contempt.

The All-India Muslim League certainly and definitely stands to safeguard the rights and interests of the Musalmans and other minorities effectively. That is its' basic and cardinal principle. That is the *Casus belli.* That is why, the Muslim League and those who stand by it have incurred the displeasure of the Congress; for what else are we doing which the Congress object to ? Congress is doing exactly what we decided two years ago. The League is not going to allow the Musalmans to be exploited either by the British Government or any other party or group inside the Legislature or outside. The Congress, with all its boasts, has done nothing in the past for the Musalmans. It has failed to inspire confidence and to create a sense of security amongst the Musalmans and other minorities. The Congress attempt, under the guise of establishing mass contact with the Musalmans, is calculated to divide and weaken and break the Musalmans, and is an effort to detach them from their accredited leaders. It is a dangerous move but it cannot mislead anyone. All such manoeuvres will not succeed, notwithstanding the various blandishments, catchwords and slogans. The only honest and straightforward couse is to give the minorities a fair deal. All the talk of hunger and poverty is intended to lead the people towards socialistic and communistic ideas, for which India is far from prepared. The Muslim League, in the present conditions, considers the policy of Direct Action suicidal and futile. Two such attempts have hitherto failed, and have entailed untold misery and suffering to the people. It (Direct Action) had to be wound up after two decades of persistent efforts in that direction, with the result that a more reactionary Constitution is forced upon the people– and the Congress is working it now !

To ask, through a resolution, that the Governor-General convey to the Secretary of State for india that he call a Constituent Assembly on the basis of adult franchise is the height of all ignorance. It shows the lack of any sense of proportion. A Constituent Assembly can only be called by a sovereign authority and from the seat of power—a special body of men

been solved, and before all important communities in India have accepted the leadership of the Congress, is like putting the cart before the horse—and to forget that one-third of Indian India stands on a very special footing, constituting the Indian States and Ruling Princes.

Instead of ploughing the sands, let the Congress at least concentrate and see that the All-India Federation Scheme embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, which is more reactionary than even the present Central Constitution, is not brought into being; for now it is emphatically and confidently asserted by those who speak with authority on behalf of the British Government that it is soon going to be inaugurated. What is the Congress going to do? Do they think that they can, single-handed as a party, prevent it? Or will some other formula be evolved, and the Congress quietly accept it as a *fait accompli*, as it has done the Provincial Constitution, in spite of all the rantings of some of the foremost leaders of the Congress against it.

May I now turn and refer to the question of Palestine? It has moved the Musalmans all over India most deeply. The whole policy of the British Government has been a betrayal of the Arabs, from its very inception. Fullest advantage has been taken of their trusting nature. Great Britain has dishonoured her proclamation to the Arabs, which had guaranteed them complete independence for the Arab homelands, and the formation of an Arab Confederation under the stress of the Great War. After having utilized them, by giving them false promises, they installed themselves as the Mandatory Power with that infamous Balfour Declaration, which was obviously irreconcilable and incapable of simultaneous execution. Then, having pursued the policy to find a national home for the Jews, Great Britain now proposes to partition Palestine, and the Royal Commission's recommendation completes the tragedy. If given effect to, it must necessarily lead to the complete ruination and destruction of every legitimate aspiration of the Arabs in their homeland—and now we are asked to look at the realities! But who created

this situation ? It has been the handiwork of and brought about sedulously by the British statesmen. The League of Nations has, it seems, and let us hope, not approved of the Royal Commission's scheme, and a fresh examination may take place. But is it a real effort intended to give the Arabs their due ? May I point out to Great Britain that this question of Palestine, if not fairly and squarely met, boldly and courageously decided, is going to be the turning point in the history of the British Empire. I am sure I am speaking not only of the Musalmans of India but of the world; and all sections of thinking and fair-minded people will agree, when I say that Great Britain will be digging its grave if she fails to honour her original proclamation, promises and intentions—pre-war and even post-war—which were so unequivocally expressed to the Arabs and the world at large. I find that a very tense feeling of excitement has been created and the British Government, out of sheer desparation are resorting to repressive measures, and ruthlessly dealing with the public opinion of the Arabs in Palestine. The Muslims of India will stand solid and will help the Arabs in every way they can in the brave and just struggle that they are carrying on against all odds. May I send them a message on behalf of the All-India Muslim League—of cheer, courage and determination in their just cause and struggle, and that I am sure they will win through ?

To the Musalmans of India in every province, in every district, in every tehsil, in every town, I say : your foremost duty is to formulate a constructive and ameliorative programme of work for the people's welfare, and to devise ways and means for the social, economic and political uplift of the Musalmans. We shall not hesitate to co-operate with any party or group in any practical and constructive programme for the welfare and advance of a province or the country, I entreat and implore that every man, woman and child should rally round the common platform and flag of the All-India Muslim League. Enlist yourselves by hundreds and thousands as quickly as you can as members of the All-India Muslim League, Provincial Leagues and District Leagues.

Organize yourselves, establish your solidarity and complete unity. Equip yourselves as trained and disciplined soldiers. Create the feeling of an *esprit de corps*, and of comradeship amongst yourselves. Work loyally, honestly and for the cause of your people and your country. No individual or people can achieve anything without industry, suffering and sacrifice. There are forces which may bully you, tyrannize over you and intimidate you, and you may even have to suffer. But it is by going through this crucible of the fire of persecution which may be levelled against you, the tyranny that may be exercised, the threats and intimidations that may unnerve you—it is by resisting, by overcoming, by facing these disadvantages, hardships and suffering, and maintaining your true convictions and loyalty, that a nation will emerge, worthy of its past glory and history, and will live to make its future history greater and more glorious not only in India, but in the annals of the world. Eighty millions of Musalmans in India have nothing to fear. They have their destiny in their hands, and as a well-knit, solid, organized, united force can face any danger, and withstand any opposition to its united front and wishes. There is the magic power in your own hands. Take your vital decisions—they may be grave and momentous and far-reaching in their consequences. Think a hundred times before you take anydec ision, but once a decision is taken, stand by it as one man. Be true and loyal, and I feel confident that success is with you.

11

BLUNDERS OF THE CONGRESS RULE*

After the last Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League which took place on October 15, 1937, I should like to place before you a brief summary of the work done and the various events that have occurred since. You know that at the last session the Constitution and the Rules of the All-India Muslim League were overhauled, and some very important changes were embodied in them. The new Constitution has now come into operation and according to the resolution of the All-India Muslim League, committees have been appointed in various provinces to organize Provincial and District Leagues all over India; and I am glad to tell you that in every province District Leagues have been established, and during the last six months, they have enrolled members not by hundreds, not by thousands, but by lakhs.

Political Awakening

During my tours in different parts of India I found a tremendous political awakening and enthusiasm among the Musalmans, and there is almost an insatiable desire amongst the people to come under the banner of the All-India Muslim League. This enormous mass of support that is rallying around the policy and programme of the All-India Muslim League requires to be harnessed, mobilized, co-ordinated and controlled. Then alone, with proper guidance, shall we achieve the goal for which we are fighting.

We have to a certain extent freed our people from the

*Presidential address delivered by M.A. Jinnah at the Special Session held at Calcutta on 17-18 April 1938.

most undesirable reactionary elements. We have in no small degree removed the unwholesome influence and fear of a certain section who used to pass off as Maulanas and Moulvis. We have made efforts to take our women with us in our struggle and in many places that I visited they took enormous interest and participated in various functions and gatherings.

We have to carry on and maintain the policy and the programme of the Muslim League on a political plane. Within less than six months we have succeeded in organizing Musalmans all over India as they never were at any time during the last century and a half. They have been galvanized and awakened in a manner which has astounded and staggered our opponents. Musalmans have shaken off their torpor and shed the miserable state of despair and demoralization into which they were sunk so deep. They are beginning to realize that they are a power. They possess the strength, the potentialities of which they have not yet realized; and if only they will take their affairs in their own hands and stand together united, there is no power that can resist their will.

Shahidganj Day

The Council of the All-India Muslim League had decided to observe the 18th of February as the Shahidganj Day. Meetings were held all over the country, and the reports that have been received in the office show that the League's word reached the far-off corners of the country. In practically every city and town, and even in some villages, the resolution of the League was carried out.

I am fully conscious that to-day the Shahidganj question is uppermost in the mind of every Musalman throughout India, and there can be no doubt that the feeling and sentiment amongst them is genuine and sincere. and there can be no question that the demolition of the mosque has deeply wounded their religious susceptibilities. The average man feels that his mosque was ruthlessly and wantonly destroyed. It is to be regretted that a great community like the Sikhs should have been carried away and have resorted to the ruthless action of

domolishing the mosque in the manner in which they did.

At the same time, I realize that certain individuals on both sides were and have been aggressive to each other, and that they created a situation which has involved the two great communities into the position of an impasse. I deplore the excesses committed on both sides, and deeply regret the loss of lives of innocent members of both the communities, and deprecate the resort to methods which resulted in destroying innocent lives. The question viewed in its true perspective is very easy of solution, if only both the communities will realize their moral obligation to each other, and put down certain mischievous and aggressive elements that make the task more difficult for an honourable settlement.

I appeal to the leaders of the Sikh community to rise above the question of prestige or *amour propre*, and I advise the Musalmans, while recognizing their deep feelings and sharing their religious susceptibilities, which I have no doubt are genuinely and deeply wounded, to realize that the way to a settlement is not reached by dictation from one community to the other.

The Council of the All-India Muslim League has already passed a resolution to which I would draw the attention of the delegates present here. It runs as follows :

"In view of the decision of the Punjab Premier, expressing his readiness to resign, even if the majority of the Muslim Members give their verdict disapproving action foreshadowed in his recent pronouncement with regard to the Shahidganj question, the Council realize that the main burden and responsibility rests with the Muslim representatives of the Punjab Legislature and the public generally. The Council appreciate that the gravity and the nature of the issues involved are present to the mind of Sir Sikandar Hayat and his Government. The assurance given by him, in his pronouncement, of his making an earnest attempt to bring about an honourable settlement of the question is the best course in the opinion of the Council; and in this direction lies the way of restoring

and securing a permanent peace and goodwill between the two great sister communities, Muslims and Sikhs, whose moral responsibility to each other, whose interest and welfare, and the larger interest of the Province and the country, demand that, with their great history, religion and traditions behind them, they should rise above the verdicts of judicial tribunals and the decisions of legislatures and Government, and rise to the occasion and come to an honourable settlement of their own; that failing such a desideratum of mutual agreement of the parties concerned, which will be most unfortunate, the Council note, with great satisfaction, the determination of the Punjab Government that it will not fail to explore and exhaust all constitutional avenues open to them to find a satisfactory and just solution of the problem, to which, Council are glad, they are already applying themselves; and that, while the final decisions as to the policy and the line of action can only be decided by the All-India Muslim League, the Council, in the meantime, are willing and ready to render all the assistance and help they can towards the solution of the matter."

It is now for you, ladies and gentlemen, to give your most anxious consideration to this question of Shahidganj and determine upon the policy and line of action that may seem proper to you.

The League and Provincial Legislatures

There are Muslim League Parties functioning inside seven out of the eleven Provincial Legislatures. The large majority of Muslim Members in all these seven Provincial Assemblies belong to the Muslim League Parties, and the membership of those Parties is increasing every day. The Muslim League contested, with great success, a number of bye-elections to the Legislative Assemblies in various Provinces. The Council of the League appointed a committee to chalk out its economic, social and educational programme for the Musalmans. The report of the Committee is being awaited with great interest.

We greatly deplore the communal riots that have taken place in the United Provinces and other Provinces. It is being

publicly stated by the Congress Ministers in these provinces that the responsibility for these riots rests on the shoulders of the Muslim League. It is most deplorable that a Minister of the Government should make such loose and untrue statements. These allegations against the Muslim League are absolutely without any foundation, and are being used as a blind against the incapacity of the Congress Government in those provinces to protect the lives and property of the people of the province. All sorts of malicious propaganda is being carried out to discredit the Muslim League. But, God willing, the Muslim League, in spite of all this, will go on getting stronger every day.

A few months ago the Muslim community was like no man's land but to-day it has come into its own and there is no power on earth that can now keep it dormant or inactive. The Musalmans have realized that their salvation lies in organizing themselves under the banner of the Muslim League; and once they are organized, they need fear no one.

Numerous representations and complaints have reached the Central Office of the hardship, ill-treatment and injustice that is meted out to Musalmans in the various Congress Provinces, and particularly to those who were workers and members of the All-India Muslim League. Therefore, the Council were obliged to appoint a special committee; under the chairmanship of Raja Mohammad Mehdi Saheb, to take such steps as may be considered proper, and to submit their report to the Council and the President.

The Council also decided to authorize me, as the President, to take all necessary steps to form a Muslim League Party in the Central Legislature, with power to the party so formed to coalesce with any other party or group whose policy and programme is approximately the same as that of the All India Muslim League. In pursuance of that resolution, I am glad to inform you that a Muslim League party in the Central Legislature, in both the Houses, has been formed and will function in the Legislature, under the supervision and control of the Council of the All-India Muslim League, from the next

session of the Central Legislature.

The Hindu Muslim Question

Although some of the pronouncements of the President and other leaders of the Congress at Haripura created an impression of a really genuine desire for the settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question—and in pursuance of that, Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru have written to me, and I have replied to their letters, and the correspondence is going on —yet there is no slackening on the part of the Congress in the determination of their set purpose to annihilate every other party, and particularly the All-India Muslim League.

The Congress attitude, so far as it can be summed up, is first that the Communal Award must go lock, stock and barrel; secondly, that there must be no separate electorates; and thirdly, that there must be no differential franchise, and if possible, there should be no reservation of seats for any community.

The result of this will be obvious : Musalmans will be wiped out from securing any adequate representation either in the legislatures or in the municipal, local and district boards —as did happen in Bihar recently, since the Government have even removed the cumulative voting which existed before they assumed office.

The Congress resolutions about fundamental rights and declarations with regard to religion, culture and language are nothing but paper resolutions. There is not the slightest doubt that the most aggressive attitude was taken up by the Congress Government on the threshold of their assuming office. They endeavoured to impose the *Bande Matram* song in the legislatures, and it is only after much bitterness and opposition that it has been dropped. They are pursuing a policy of making Hindi a compulsory language, which must necessarily, if not completely, destroy—at any rate, vitally undermine the spread of the development of Urdu; and what is worse still, is that Hindi with its Hindu Sanskritic literature

and philosophy and ideals will and must necessarily be forced upon Muslim children and students.

In various parts of India, serious difficulties are put in the way of Muslims enjoying the liberty of observing their religious rights freely. It is one thing to make every high-sounding declaration, such as the Congress are in the habit of making, and its Working Committee of repeating them; it is quite another thing to translate them into action—and so far, the Congress are preaching one thing, and practising just the contrary.

The President of the Congress, Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, having quoted these paper resolutions about the so-called protection of religion, culture and language, proceeded to state: "The time is opportune for renewing our efforts for the final solution of the problem. I believe I am voicing the feelings of all Congressmen when I say that we are eager to do our very best to arrive at an agreed solution consistent with the fundamental principles of nationalism."

Here I wish he was speaking on behalf of all the Congressmen as he believed he was! It is no use masquerading under the name of nationalism. The Congress is a Hindu body mainly. It is begging the whole question to say that 'we are eager to do our very best to arrive at an agreed solution' and qualify it by saying 'consistently with the fundamental principles of nationalism' as if the Muslim League were opposed to the fundamental principles of nationalism. Muslims have made it clear more than once that, besides the question of religion, culture, language and personal laws, there is another question, equally of life and death for them, and that their future destiny and fate are dependent upon their securing definitely their political rights, their due share in the national life, the Government, and the administration of the country.

They will fight for it till the last ditch, and all the dreams and notions of Hindu Raj must be abandoned. They will not be submerged or dominated, and they will not surrender so

long as there is life in them.

Equality with the Congress

The Muslim League claims the status of complete equality with the Congress, or any other organization, and we have our problems to solve. We have, under the present conditions, to organize our people, to build up the Muslim masses for a better world and for their immediate uplift, social and economic, and we have to formulate plans of a constructive and ameliorative character, which would give them immediate relief from the poverty and wretchedness from which they are suffering more than any other section of the people in India.

I welcome a policy of live and let live. I welcome an understanding in matters economic and political. But we cannot surrender, submerge or submit to the dictates or the ukase of the High Command of the Congress which is developing into a totalitarian and authoritative causes, functioning under the name of the Working Committee, and aspiring to the position of a shadow cabinet in a future republic.

The Muslim League is not only carrying on a struggle for the Muslims; it maintains that all other important minorities must have the same sense of security and a place in the sun of India, where they will enjoy their rights and privileges as free citizens, and not be ground down by caste-tyranny and caste-rule.

In my opinion, the Congress is making one of the greatest blunders by pursuing its present policy. The High Command of the Congress has no policy except opportunism and arrogance. They are utilizing their organization, because it happens to be the largest and most powerful, to treat every other party with contempt, and they imagine that they have already become the rulers of India. It is astounding that they believe that they have conquered six provinces absolutely, and in the seventh they have a dominant voice, as the majority in

the coalition of the North-West Frontier Province are Congressmen. They talk of drums beating, and they believe that it will not be very long before the remaining four Provinces fall before the conquering heroes of the High Command of the Congress.

But to the Musalmans, I say that they must realize that there cannot be any honourable settlement between two parties when one claims to be superior to the other, and has for its aim and object the domination and dictation of the other. Honourable settlement can only be achieved between equals, and unless the two parties learn to respect and fear each other, there is no solid ground for any settlement.

Besides even if a settlement does come, unless the Musalmans are fully organized and have forged sanctions behind them, as well as the solid and united backing behind them, the agreements, pacts or treaties can only be treated as a scrap of paper—i.e., unless they can be enforced by a power from behind, which will see that the terms are carried out and maintained.

Therefore, my appeal to the Musalmans is : Don't depend upon anybody. You must depend upon your own inherent strength. The Musalmans have not yet realized what power and strength they would possess if they were properly mobilized as one solid people. We have to go through a great deal of spade work and suffering. Our opponents will use all possible means of suppression. They may practise tryanny and may persecute us; but I am confident that we shall emerge out of that ordeal better. stronger than we have ever been.

12

RESOLVE TO DO OR DIE*

I thank you for the great honour that you, the people of Patna and Bihar, have done me. It is a matter of great satisfaction to me that such a large number of people have come from all parts of Bihar, and from all over India to attend this Session. I thank them for the trouble they have taken. I also thank those who have taken great pains to make this Session a success and who have built this wounderful "pandal" and made all these marvellous arrangements.

Before I come to deal with the problems which are engaging our attention, I must express our joint and deep sorrow at the passing away of Maulana Shaukat Ali. Maulana Shaukat Ali was a great man, a man who was always ready and willing to make any and every sacrifice for the cause in which he believed. He was a colleague and a personal friend of mine. He never swerved even by an inch from the path he had chosen and served the cause of the Muslim League with unflagging zeal to the very last. It is not only a personal loss, but, I am sure, also a national Muslim loss, which is mourned all over India.

Another great figure, a world figure, who passed away is Mustafa Kemal Ataturk. His death has come as the greatest blow to the Muslim world. He was the foremost figure in the Muslim East. In Persia and Afghanistan, in Egypt and, of course, in Turkey, he proved, to the consternation of the rest of the world, that Muslim nations were coming into their own. In Kemal Ataturk the Islamic world has lost a great

*Presidential address delivered by M.A. Jinnah at the Patna Session held on 26-29 December,1938.

hero. With the example of this great Musalman in front of them as an inspiration, will the Muslims of India still remain in quagmire ?

The Muslim League has already deplored the loss of Dr. Sir Mohammad Iqbal. His death, too, is an irreparable loss to Muslim India. He was a personal friend of mine and a singer of the finest poetry in the world. He will live as long as Islam will live. His noble poetry interprets the true aspirations of the Muslims of India. It will remain an inspiration for us and for generations after us.

The Falsehood of the Congress

Ladies and Gentlemen, I will now refer to the position of the Muslim League. It was only three years ago that we laid down the policy and programme of the All-India Muslim League at Bombay. The position at that time was this. Of the intelligentsia of the Muslims who were in the forefront of what is called political life, most—I do not say all—were careerists. They chose their place according to their convenience, either in the bureaucratic camp or in the other camp, that is, the Congress camp. Those who thought that they could better their position by joining the bureaucratic camp joined it. The others thought they could get position and power in the Congress camp, and joined that camp. Their object was how best to make careers for themselves. So far as the masses were concerned, and so far as my dear young friends, the Muslim youth, were concerned, they were all hypnotized by the Congress faleshood. The youth believed their slogans and catchwords. They were caught right in the net that was spread for them by the Congress. They were led into the belief that the Congress was fighting for the freedom of the motherland. Being honest themselves, they could not believe that other people could be otherwise. They were led to believe that the question was really an economic one, and that they were fighting for *dal-bhat*, for labour and the *Kisans*. Their pure, untutored minds became easy victims of the Congress net. When we, who saw through the game and understood the inward meaning of the Congress leaders' move,

tried to make them understand that they were being misled, we were dubbed reactionaries, communalists, and much else besides.

That was the position in 1936. I am glad to say that things have now changed. One thing has been demonstrated beyond boubt, namely that the Congress High Command wanted the Musalmans to be a mere understudy of the Congress, mere footpages of the Congress leaders, to be used, governed and brought to heel when they had served the purpose of the Congress. The Congress leaders wanted them to submit unconditionally to Hindu Raj. That game has now been fully exposed. We have got ample proof of it. The Chairman of the Reception Committee has indicated some of those proofs in his address. I congratulate him for his most eloquent exposition of the true state of affairs in this country and also of the aims and objects of the Congress.

The Congress has now, you must be aware, killed every hope of Hindu-Muslim settlement in the right royal fashion of Fascism. The Congress does not want any settlement with the Muslims. It wants to thrust its own terms on the Muslims of India. As the Chairman of the Reception Committee has said in his address, the Congress wants the Muslims to accept the settlement as a gift from the majority. The Congress High Command makes the preposterous claim that they are entitled to speak on behalf of the whole of India, that they alone are capable of delivering the goods. Others are asked to accept the gift as from a mighty sovereign. The Congress High Command declares that they will redress the grievances of the Muslims, and they expect the Muslims to accept the declaration. I want to make it plain to all concerned that we Muslims want no gifts. The Muslims want no concessions. We, Muslims of India, have made up our mind to secure our full rights, but we shall have them as rights, not as gifts or concessions.

As I have said before, there are four forces at play in this country. Firstly, there is the British Government. Secondly, there are the rulers and peoples of the Indian States. Thirdly, there are the Hindus; and fourthly, there are the Muslims. The

Congress press may clamour as much as it likes; they may bring out their morning, afternoon, evening and night editions; the Congress leaders may shout as much as they like that the Congress is a national body. But I say it is not true. The Congress is nothing but a Hindu body. That is the truth and the Congress leaders know it. The presence of the few Muslims, the few misled and misguided ones, and the few ulterior motives, does who are there with not, cannot, make it a national body. I challenge anybody to deny that the Congress is not mainly a Hindu body. I ask, does the Congress represent the Muslim ? (Shouts of "No, no" which were repeated as indicated below.)

I ask does the Congress represent the Christians ? ("No.")
I ask does the Congress represent the Scheduled Castes ? ("No.")
I ask does the Congress represent the non-Brahmans ? ("No.")

I say the Congress does not even represent all the Hindus. What about the Hindu Mahasabha ? What about the Liberal Federation ? The Congress, no doubt, is the largest single party in the country. But it is nothing more than that. It may arrogate to itself whatever titles it likes : the Congress High Command, in the intoxications of power, like persons who are drunk, may make any claims it pleases them to make. But such claims cannot alter the true character of the Congress. It remains what it is—mainly a Hindu body.

Congress Determined to Crush Minorities

Such claims might have hoodwinked some people for some time, but they cannot hoodwink all the people all the time—and can certainly not hoodwink the Muslims any longer. I am convinced—I think you are also now convinced, and many who are not yet convinced will soon be convinced, and those who are honestly mistaken now, not those who are dishonest in their conviction, will also be convinced—that the Congress is not a national body. It is a misfortune of our country, indeed it is a tragedy, that the High Command of the

Congress is determined, absolutely determined, to crush all other communities and cultures in this corntry, and to establish Hindu Raj. They talk of *Swaraj*, but they mean Hindu Raj. They talk of National Government, but they mean only Hindu Government. But the bubble has been pricked too soon. Intoxicated with power gained under the new Constitution, with their majority in six or seven provinces, the Congress has had its game exposed a little to soon. What did the Congress do when it came to power? With all its pretensions of nationalism, it straightaway started with the *Bande Mataram*. It is admitted that *Bande Mataram* is not the national song, yet it is sung as such, and thrust upon others. It is sung not only in their own gatherings, but Muslim children in Government and Municipal schools, too, are compelled to sing it. Muslim children must accept *Bande Mataram* as their national song, no matter whether their religious beliefs permit them to do so or not. It is idolatrous and worse—a hymn of hatred for Muslims.

Take the case of the Congress flag. Admittedly it is not the national flag of India. Yet that flag must be respected by everyone, and hoisted on every Government and public building. It does not matter if the Muslims object to it, the Congress flag must be paraded as the national flag of India, and be thrust upon the Muslims.

Take next the case of Hindi-Hindustani. I need not add to what has already been said on the Subject by the Chairman of the Reception Committee. Is there any doubt now in the mind of any one that the whole scheme of Hindi-Hindustani is intended to stifle and suppress Urdu?

Take next the Wardha Scheme of Education. Were the Muslims taken into confidence when the Scheme was under preparation? The whole Scheme was conceived of, and its details worked out, behind the back of the Muslims. Who is the author of the Scheme? Who is the genius behind it? Mr. Gandhi. I have no hesitation in saying that it is Mr. Gandhi who is destroying the ideal with which the Congress was started. He is the one man responsible for turning the Congress into an instrument for the revival of Hinduism. His

ideal is to revive the Hindu religion and establish Hindu Raj in this Country, and he is utilizing the Congress to further this object.

The reaction of the Muslims to such a scheme of education could not but be what it has been all over the country. You have seen the Pirpur Report,* and I need not add to what has been described in that document. The position may be summed up in one sentence. To-day the Hindu mentality, the Hindu outlook, is being carefully nurtured, and Muslims are being forced to accept these new conditions and to submit to the orders of the Congress leaders. This Hindu outlook is daily interfering with the normal life of the Muslim. The Musalmans are being forced to accept Hindu ideals in their daily life. Have Muslims anywhere done anything of the sort? Have they anywhere sought to impose Muslim culture on the Hindus? Yet whenever Muslims have raised the slightest voice of protest against the imposition of Hindu culture on them, they have been branded as communalists and disturbers of peace, and the repressive machinery of the Congress Governments has been set in motion against them. Take the cases that have occured in Bihar. Who have suffered suppression of culture under the Congress Government? It is the Musalmans. Against whom are the repressive measures taken, prohibitory orders issued—and among whom are arrests made? It is the Muslims. I should like to know a single instance—I am prepared to learn and correct myself—a single instance where the Muslim League, or Muslim individuals, may have tried to force their own culture upon the Hindus in the last eighteen months.

Muslim Awakening of National Consciousness

I do not wish to dwell any longer upon this. I have done

---

*On the hardship, ill-treatment and injustice meted out to Muslims in Congress Government Provinces, issued on November 15, 1938, by the Committee appointed by the League Council on March 2, 1938, chaired by Raja Syed Mohammad Mehdi of Pirpur, and comprising five other members.

with it, so far as the Congress is concerned. As regards the Musalmans, I can say that it is a matter of great congratulation to the All-India Muslim League that it has succeeded in awakening a remarkable national conciousness among the Muslims. Muslims, as I said before, were like men who had lost their moral, cultural and political consciousness. You have not yet got to the fringe of acquiring that moral, cultural and political consciousness. You have only reached that stage at which an awakening has come—your political conscience has been stirred.

Today you find—apart from the fact of whether the Congress claims are right or wrong—today you find that the Hindus have to a very large degree acquired that essential quality, moral, cultural and political consciousness—and it has become the national consciousness of the Hindus. This is the force behind them; that is the force I want the Muslims to acquire. When you have acquired that, believe me, I have no doubt in my mind you will realize what you want. The counting of heads may be a very good thing; but it is not the final arbiter of the destiny of nations. You have yet to develop a national self and a national individuality. It is a big task; and as I have told you, you are yet only on the fringe of it. But, I have great hopes for our success. The developments that have already taken place are almost miraculous. I never dreamed we could make this wonderful demonstration that we see to-day. But even then, we are only on the fringe of the problem.

Palestine

Among the immediate issues we have to grapple with, which may come up before the Subjects Committee, is the question of Palestine. I know how deeply Muslim feelings have been stirred over the issue of Palestine. I know Muslims will not shirk from any sacrifice if required to help the Arabs who are engaged in the fight for their national freedom. You know the Arabs have been treated shamelessly—men who, fighting for the freedom of their country, have been

described as gangsters, and subjected to all forms of repression. For defending their homelands, they are being put down at the point of the beyonet, and with the help of martial laws. But no nation, no people who are worth living as a nation, can achieve anything great without making great sacrifices, such as the Arabs of Palestine are making. All our sympathies are with those valiant martyrs who are fighting the battle of freedom against usurpers. They are being subjected to monstrous injustices which are being propped up by British Imperialism with the ulterior motive of placating the international Jewry which commands the money-bags. That question we will have to consider.

The Situation in the Indian States

Another question that will come up for consideration is the situation that is developing in the Indian States. You have heard the Chairman of the Reception Committee on that subject. One point I should like to add to his observations. As you are all aware, we are in full sympathy with the aspirations of the States' people. I am convinced, however, as I am convinced about the real objects of the Congress, that the motive of the Congress championing the rights of the States people is far from what it is made out to be. I would like to put only one question. Why all this agitation in the States? Why are all the forces being let loose in the name of the Arya Samajists and the Hindu Mahasabha in Hyderabad State? I would ask the Congress, what is it doing in Kashmir? The Arya Samajists, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Congress nationalists, as also the Press, the subservient Press of the Congress, why are they silent about the affairs of Kashmir State? Is it because Kashmir is a Hindu State? Is it because the vast majority of the Indian subjects of Kashmir State are Muslims? I have no doubt about the real meaning of the Congress solicitude for the people of the Indian States.

Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose has said, in one of his speeches, that the Congress wants to make an alliance with the peoples of the Indian States. May I ask do they want to

make an alliance only with those who are Hindus or also with the Musalmans ? According to the present Constitution of the Muslim League, the League cannot interfere in the affairs of the Indian States. But I want to make it clear that if the Congress pursues its campaign in Muslim States like Hyderabad, with the ulterior motive which undoubtedly is inspiring it at present, the Muslim League would have to consider afresh the question of interference with the affairs of Indian States. We cannot leave our Muslim brethren in the Hindu States at the tender mercies of their oppressors and those who wish to exploit them.

Federation

The next question that you will have to consider is that of Federation. Let the Congress continue to say that they will never accept the Federation. But I tell you I do not at all believe in the professions of the Congress. The Congress will tumble into it just as it tumbled into the provincial part of the Constitution. Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose was loud in his declaration the other day that whatever individual Congress-men might say here and there, the Congress as a whole was determined to reject the Federation lock, stock, and barrel. do not believe in such declarations. I know another Congress leader has said that revision and modification will satisfy them; and if the elective principle was accepted, it would appease the Congress. Yet another leader has declared that if the Federal Scheme could be so altered as to give them the substance of independence, the Congress might work it, and in that way the undesirable and unworkable Federal Constitution might be made a desirable and workable one. I say the whole idea behind the Congress leaders' move is once again to deceive the Muslims. I want to tell these leaders, however, that they cannot deceive the Muslims any more. The Muslims are not what they were three years ago. The whole game of the Congress is and has been to get a substantial majority in this wretched, highly objectionable and rotten Constitution which they want to enjoy. If they get a majority, they will accept the Federation with utmost glee; and then they will begin to

pursue their nefarious scheme of destroying the Muslim culture and organization, and to build up the Congress organization, as the one and only totalitarian organization on the Fascist pattern. Then they will be able to establish their ideal of Hindu Raj in Hindustan.

Congress Intrigues

The Congress leaders know what they are aiming at. They have got their majorities in seven provinces, and have Congress Governments there. There are only four provinces left. The covetous eyes of the Congress leaders are now cast upon these provinces. Every now and then they declare that the non-Congress Governments in [these provinces are tottering, aye, tottering in spite of their majorities, struggling on their last legs. The Congress leaders think that in these four provinces the Ministries are not very strong. But it is not difficult to see through the Congress game. They want to see a Congress Government in whichever of these provinces they can. I had a talk with some friends of the North-West Frontier Province. I am told that in that Province our co-religionists—credulous Pathans as they are—have been told that the Congress is for the good of the people, that the Muslim League is the supporter of Imperialism and an ally of Imperialism. I say there cannot be a greater falsehood than the allegation that the Muslim Legaue is an ally of Imperialism. Inside the legislature or outside the legislature, have I on any single occasion supported Imperialism, not to speak of proving myself an ally of Imperialism ?

I am sure that, even if there were a few Muslims who had thought in the Past that the Muslims might gain their ends through an alliance with British Imperialism, they have now been thoroughly disillusioned. I say the Muslim League is not going to be an ally of anyone, but would be the ally of even the devil if need be in the interest of Muslims.

It is not because we are in love with Imperialism; but in politics one has to play one's game as on a chess-board. I say the Muslims and the Muslim League have only one ally,

and that ally is the Muslim nation; and the one and only one to whom they can look for help is God.

The Congress game with regard to Federation is very clear. If the Congress can gain control over the Federal machinery, then, by means of the direct and indirect powers vested in the Federal Government, the Congress would be able to reduce to a non-entity the Government of the Hon'ble Mr. Fazlul Huq in Bengal and Hon'ble Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan in the Punjab; so that, in the end, the Congress would have seven provinces where they would enjoy an overwhelming numerical majority as a gift of God, and the other four provinces where Muslims dominate would be the feudatories of the Congress High Command.

If I am right in my judgement, that is the objective of the Congress. Therefore, I say the Congress opposition to the Federation is not honest, Am I to blame for it ? Am I wrong ?

Face to Face with a Life and Death Struggle

Ladies and Gentlemen, now it is for you and you alone to make your decision. All the responsibilities will be yours. You are face to face with a life and death struggle. You should not allow your attention to be deflected by small question : so and so have not been taken into the Working Committee of the League; so and so should not be in the League. Such small matters should not divert your attention from the main issues confronting the community. Only this morning some young men came to me and complained about the personnel of the League. They said that certain persons, whose names I need not mention, should not be in the League. To these young men, as well as to the others, I say that the Muslim League is not yet what it should be. I am prepared to admit that there are men who are not true Leaguers. But the Muslim League is the organization of all Muslims. It is your organization. Let me tell my young friends, if they want to purify the Muslim League, if they want to raise the Muslim League to the highest glory, it is no use keeping out and finding

faults with it. Come in, and if there is anything wrong with it, put it right.

Therefore, I appeal to everyone : Come into the Muslim League. It is your organization. It is not the property of this man or that man. It is your organization, and you can make it as you like and what you like ? I think I have said all that I had to say. You will forgive me for having made the speech extempore. My health did not permit me to write out my speech. Besides, I have already made so many speeches. The last speech I made was at Karachi, only in October last. I expressed my views on that occasion as on other occasions. My views are therefore well-known.

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to me to see that a great awakening has taken place among the Muslims. They have grasped the real issues. That is a great beginning. Having made this great beginning, if you now harness your energies and mobilize your forces like a disciplined army, victory will be yours

(Concluding Remarks in Urdu)

Mr. Jinnah then addressed the gathering in Urdu. He appealed to them to close their ranks. He said that when the Congress started the Muslim Mass Contact campaign, they threw out a challenge that the Muslim masses were with them. The Assembly by-elections in the U.P. and the more recent one at Hazaribagh in Bihar had given the proper reply to the Congress challenge. And now the Congress refused even to set up their own candidate in the by-election to the Central Assembly (caused by the death of Maulana Shaukat Ali). What had happened, he asked, to the Congress Muslim Contact Campaign ? He added that the Congress should now give up this Contact affair. Proceeding, Mr. Jinnah said that they were now told that there was no possibility of a settlement, and that the Muslims were to be won over on independent lines. "Let us wait and see what those independent lines are."

13

TWO-NATION THEORY AND CALL FOR PARTITION*

We are meeting today in our session after 15 months. The last session of the All-India Muslim League took place at Patna in December 1938. Since then many developments have taken place. I shall first shortly tell you what the All-India Muslim League had to face after the Patna Session of 1938.

Assessment of Developments since 1938

You remember that one of the tasks, which was imposed on us and which is far from completed yet, was to organize Muslim Leagues all over India. We have made enormous progress during the last 15 months in this direction. I am glad to inform you that we have established Provincial Leagues in every Province. The next point is that in every by-election to the Legislative Assemblies we had to fight with powerful opponents. I congratulate the Musalmans for having shown enormous grit and spirit throughout our trials. There was not a single by-election in which our opponents won against Muslim League candidates. In the last election to the U.P. Council, that is the Upper Chamber, the Muslim League's success was cent per cent. I do not want to weary you with details of what we have been able to do in the way of forging ahead in the direction of organizing the Muslim League. But I may tell you that it is going up by leaps and bounds.

Next, you may remember that we appointed a committee of ladies at the Patna Session. It is of very great importance

Presidential address delivered by M.A. Jinnah at the Lahore Session held on 22-24 March, 1940.

to us, because I believe that it is absolutely essential for us to give every opportunity to our women to participate in our struggle of life and death. Women can do a great deal within their homes even under *purdah*. We appointed this committee with a view to enable them to participate in the work of the League. The objects of this central committee were (1) to organize provincial and district Muslim Leagues; (2) to enlist a larger number of women to the membership of the Muslim League; (3) to carry on an intensive propaganda amongst Muslim women throughout India in order to create in them a sense of a greater political consciousness---because if political consciousness is awakened amongst our women, remember, your children will not have much to worry about; (4) to advise and guide them in all such matters as mainly rest on them for the uplift of the Muslim society. This Central Committee, I am glad to say, started its work seriously and earnestly. It has done a great deal of useful work. I have no doubt that when we come to deal with their report of work done, we shall really feel grateful to them for all the services that they have rendered to the Muslim League.

We had many difficulties to face from January 1939 right up to the declaration of war. We had to face the Vidya Mandir in Nagpur. We had to face the Wardha Scheme all over India. We had to face ill-treatment and oppression on Muslims in the Congress-governed provinces. We had to face the treatment meted out to Muslims in some of the Indian States, such as Jaipur and Bhavnagar. We had to face a vital issue that arose in that little State of Rajkot. Rajkot was the acid test made by the Congress, which would have affected one-third of India. Thus the Muslim League had all along to face various issues from January 1939 up to the time of the declaration of war. Before the war was declared, the greatest danger to the Muslims of India was the possible inauguration of a federal scheme in the Central Government. We know what machinations were going on. But the Muslim League was stoutly resisting them in every direction. We felt that we could never accept the dangerous scheme of the Central Federal Government embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935.

I am sure that we have made no small contribution towards persuading the British Government to abandon the scheme of the Central Federal Government. In creating that mind in the British Government, the Muslim League, I have no doubt, played no small part. You know that the British people are a very obdurate people. They are also very conservative; and although they are very clear, they are slow in understanding. After the war was declared, the Viceroy naturally wanted help from the Muslim League. It was only then that he realized that the Muslim League was a power. For it will be remembered that up to the time of the declaration of war, the Viceroy never thought of me, but of Gandhi and Gandhi alone. I have been the leader of an important party in the Legislature for a considerable time, larger than the one I have the honour to lead at present, the Muslim League Party in the Central Legislature. Yet, the Viceroy never thought of me before. Therefore, when I got this invitation from the Viceroy along with Mr. Gandhi, I wondered within myself why I was so suddenly promoted, and then I concluded that the answer was the 'All-India Muslim League', whose President I happen to be. I believe that was the worst shock that the Congress High Command received, because it challenged their sole authority to speak on behalf of India. And it is quite clear from the attitude of Mr. Gandhi and the High Command that they have not yet recovered from that shock. My point is that I want you to realize the value, the importance, the significance of organizing ourselves, I will not say anything more on the subject.

But a great deal yet remains to be done. I am sure from what I can see and hear that Muslim India is now conscious, is now awake, and the Muslim League has by now grown into such a strong institution that it cannot be destroyed by anybody, whoever he may happen to be. Men may come and men may go, but the League will live for ever.

Now, coming to the period after the declaration of war, position was that we were between the devil and the deep sea. But I do not think that the devil or the deep sea is going to

get away with it. Anyhow our position is this: We stand unequivocally for the freedom of India. But it must be the freedom of all India, and not the freedom of one section or, worse still, of the Congress caucus, and slavery for Musalmans and other minorities.

Building Up Self-Reliance

Situated in India as we are, we naturally have our past experiences, and particularly from the experiences of the past two and a half years of Provincial Constitution in the Congress-governed provinces, we have learnt many lessons. We are now, therefore, very apprehensive and can trust nobody. I think it is a wise rule for everyone not to trust anybody too much. Sometimes we are led to trust people; but when we find in actual experience that our trust has been betrayed, surely that ought to be sufficient lesson for any man not to continue his trust in those who have betrayed him.

Ladies and gentlemen, we never thought that the Congress High Command would have acted in the manner in which they actually did in the Congress-governed provinces. I never dreamt that they would ever come down so low as that. I never could believe that there would be a gentlemen's agreement between the Congress and the Government to such an extent that, although we cried ourselves hoarse, week in and out, the Governors would be supine and the Governor-General helpless. We reminded them of their special responsibilities to us and to other minorities, and the solemn pledges they had given to us. But all that had become a dead letter. Fortunately, Providence came to our help, and that gentlemen's agreement was broken to pieces, and the Congress, thank Heaven, went out of office. I think they are regretting their resignations very much. Their bluff was called. So far so good.

I, therefore, appeal to you, in all the seriousness that I can command to organize yourselves in such a way that you may depend upon none except your own inherent strength. That is your only safeguard and the best safeguard. Depend upon yourselves. This does not mean that we should have

ill-will or malice towards others. In order to safeguard your rights and interests, you must create that strength in yourselves with which you may be able to defend yourselves. That is all that I want to urge.

Issues for the Future Constitution

Now, what is our position with regard to the future Constitution ? It is that, as soon as circumstances permit, or immediately after the war at the latest, the whole problem of India's future Constitution must be examined *de novo,* and the Act of 1935 must go once for all. We do not believe in asking the British Government to make declarations. These declarations are really of no use. You cannot possibly succeed in getting the British Government out of this country by asking them to make declarations. However, the Congress asked the Viceroy to make a declaration. The Viceroy said, "I have made the declaration." The Congress said, "No no, we want another kind of declaration. You must declare, now and at once, that India is free and independent, with the right to frame its own Constitution, through a Constituent Assembly to be elected on the basis of adult franchise, or as low a franchise as possible. This Assembly will of course satisfy the minorities' legitimate interests." Mr. Gandhi says that if the minorities are not satisfied, then he is willing that some tribunal of the highest character, and most impartial, should decide the dispute. Now apart from the impracticable character of this proposal, and quite apart from the fact that it is historically and constitutionally absurd to ask the ruling power to abdicate in favour of a Constituent Assembly—apart from all that, suppose we do not agree as to the franchise according to which the Central Assembly is to be elected, or suppose we, the solid body of Muslim representatives, do not agree with the non-Muslim majority in the Constituent Assembly, what will happen ? It is said that we have no right to disagree with regard to anything that this Assembly may do in framing a National Constitution of this huge Subcontinent, except in those matters which may be germane to the safeguards of the minorities. So we are given the privilege to

disagree only with regard to what may strictly be called safeguards of the rights and interests of minorities. We are also given the privilege to send our own representatives by separate electorates. Now, this proposal is based on the assumption that as soon as the Constitution comes into operation the British hand will disappear. Otherwise there will be no meaning in it. Of course, Mr. Gandhi says that the Constitution will decide whether the British will disappear, and if so to what extent. In other words, his proposal comes to this : first give me the declaration that we are a free and independent nation, then I will decide what I should give you back.

Does Mr. Gandhi really want the complete independence of India when he talks like this ? But whether the British disappear or not, it follows that extensive powers must be transferred to the people. In the event of there being a disagreement between the majority of the Constituent Assembly and the Musalmans, in the first instance, who will appoint the tribunal ? And suppose an agreed tribunal is possible, and the award is made and the decision given, who will, may I know, be there to see that this award is implemented or carried out in accordance with the terms of that award ? And who will see that it is honoured in practice, because, we are told, the British will have parted with their power, mainly or completely ? Then what will be the sanction behind the award which will enforce it ? We come back to the same answer; the Hindu majority would do it—and will it be with the help of the British bayonet or Mr. Gandhi's 'Ahimsa' ? Can we trust them any more ? Besides, ladies and gentlemen, can you imagine that a question of this character, of a social contract upon which the future Constitution of India would be based, affecting 90 millions of Musalmans, can be decided by means of a judicial tribunal ? Still, that is the proposal of the Congress.

Before I deal with what Mr. Gandhi said a few days ago, I shall deal with the pronouncements of some of the other Congress leaders—each one speaking with a different voice. Mr. Rajagopalachari, the ex-Prime Minister of Madras, says that

"I would be happy indeed if he could keep me in his pocket."

I do not know really what to say to this latest offer of his.

"There was a time when I could say that there was no Muslim whose confidence I did not enjoy. It is my misfortune that it is not so to-day."

Why has he lost the confidence of the Muslims to-day ? May I ask, ladies and gentlemen ?

"I do not read all that appears in the Urdu Press, but perhaps I get a lot of abuse there, I am not sorry for it. I still believe that without a Hindu-Muslim settlement there can be no *Swaraj*."

Mr. Gandhi has been saying this now for the last 20 years.

"You will perhaps ask in that case why do I talk of a fight. I do so because it is to be a fight for a Constituent Assembly."

He is fighting the British. But may I point out to Mr. Gandhi and the Congress that they are fighting for a Constituent Assembly which the Muslims say they cannot accept—which, the Muslims say, means three to one, about which the Musalmans say that they will never be able, in that way, by the counting of heads, to come to any agreement which will be a real agreement from the heart, which will enable all to work as friends; and, therefore, this idea of a Constituent Assembly is objectionable, apart from other objections. But he is fighting for the Constituent Assembly, not fighting the Musalmans at all.

He says, "I do so because it is to be a fight for a Constituent Assembly. If Muslims who come to the Constituent Assembly", mark the words "who come to the Constituent Assembly through Muslim votes"—he is first

forcing us to come to that Assembly, and then says—"declare that there is nothing common between Hindus and Muslims, then alone would I give up all hope; but even then I would agree with them because they read the Quran and I have also studied something of that holy book."

So he wants the Constituent Assembly for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the Musalmans; and if they do not agree, then he will give up all hopes, but even then he will agree with us. Well, I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, is this the way to show any real, genuine desire—if there existed any —to come to a settlement with the Musalmans ? Why does not Mr. Gandhi agree—and I have suggested this to him more than once, and I repeat it again from this platform—why does not Mr. Gandhi honestly now acknowledge that the Congress is a Hindu Congress, that he does not represent anybody except the solid body of a Hindu people ? Why should not Mr. Gandhi be proud to say, 'I am a Hindu, the Congress has solid Hindu backing ? I am not ashamed of saying that I am a Musalman. I am right I hope, and I think even a blind man must have been convinced by now, that the Muslim League has the solid backing of the Musalmans of India. Why then all this camouflage ? Why all these machinations ? Why all these methods to coerce the British to overthrow the Musalmans ? Why this declaration of non-co-operation ? Why this threat of civil disobedience ? And why fight for a Constituent Assembly for the sake of ascertaining whether the Musalmans agree or they do not agree ? Why not come as a Hindu leader proudly representing your people and let me meet you proudly representing the Musalmans. This is all that I have to say so far as the Congress is concerned.

Negotiations with the British

So far as the British Government is concerned, our negotiations are not concluded yet, as you know. We had asked for assurances on several points. At any rate, we have made some advance with regard to one point, and that is this. You remember, our demand was that the entire problem of the future constitution of India should be examined

de novo, apart from the Government of India Act of 1935. To that, the Viceroy's reply, with the authority of His Majesty's Government, was—I had better quote that, I will not put it in my own words. This is the reply that was sent to us on the 23rd of December :

"My answer to your first question is that the declaration I made with the approval of His Majesty's Government on October the 13th last does not exclude"—Mark the words—"does not exclude examination of any part either of the Act of 1935 or of the policy and plans on which it is based."

As regards other matters, we are still negotiating and the most important are : that no declaration should be made by His Majesty's Government with regard to the future Constitution of India without our approval and consent, and that no settlement of any question should be made with any party behind our back, unless our approval and consent is given to it. Well, ladies and gentlemen, whether the British Government in their wisdom agree to give us that assurance or not, I trust that they will still see that it is a fair and just demand, when we say that we cannot leave the future fate and the destiny of 90 millions of people in the hands of any other judge. We and we alone wish to be the final arbiter. Surely that is a just demand. We do not want that the British Government should thrust upon the Musalmans a Constitution which they do not approve of, and to which they do not agree. Therefore, the British Government will be well advised to give that assurance, and give the Musalmans complete pace and confidence in this matter, and win their friendship. But whether they do that or not—after all, as I told you before, we must depend on our own inherent strength—I make it plain from this platform that if any declaration is made, if any interim settlement is made without our approval and without our consent, the Musalmans of India will resist it. And no mistake should be made on that score.

Then the next point was with regard to Palestine. We

are told that endeavours, earnest endeavours, are being made to meet the reasonable national demands of the Arabs. Well we cannot be satisfied by earnest endeavours, sincere endeavours, best endeavours. We want that the British Government should in fact and actually meet the demands of the Arabs in Palestine.

Then the point was with regard to sending troops outside. Here there is some misunderstanding. But anyhow we have made our position clear, that we never intended, and, in fact, the language does not justify it, if there is any misapprehension or apprehension that Indian troops should not be used to the fullest in the defence of our own country. What we wanted the British Government to give us assurance of was that Indian troops should not be sent against any Muslim country or any Muslim Power. Let us hope that we may yet be able to get the British Government to clarify the position further.

This, then, is the position with regard to the British Government. The last meeting of the Working Committee had asked the Viceroy to reconsider his letter of the 23rd of December, having regard to what has been explained to him in pursuance of the resolution of the Working Committee, dated the 3rd of February, and we are informed that the matter is receiving his careful cosideration.

The Hindu-Muslim Situation

Ladies and gentlemen, that is where we stand after the war and up to the 3rd of February. As far as our internal position is concerned, we have also been examining it; and, you know, there are several schemes which have been sent by various well-informed constitutionalists and others who take interest in the problem of India's future Constitution, and we have also appointed a subcommittee to examine the details of the schemes that have come in so far. But one thing is quite clear. It has always been taken for granted mistakenly that the Musalmans are a minority, and of course we have got used to it for such a long time that these settled notions sometimes are very difficult to remove. The Musalmans are not a minority.

The Musalmans are a nation by any definition.

The British and particularly the Congress proceed on the basis. "Well, you are a minority after all, what do you want? What else do the minorities want? Just as Babu Rajendra Prasad said. But surely the Musalmans are not a minority. We find that even according to the British map of India, we occupy large parts of this country where the Musalmans are in a majority—such as Bengal, Punjab, N.W.F.P., Sind and Baluchistan.

Now the question is, what is the best solution of this problem between the Hindus and the Musalmans? We have been considering—and as I have already said, a committee has been appointed to consider the various proposals. But whatever the final scheme for a Constitution, I will present to you my views and I will just read to you, in confirmation of what I am going to put before you, a letter from Lala Lajpat Rai to Mr. C.R. Das. It was written I believe, about 12 or 15 years ago, and the letter has been produced in a book by one Indra Prakash, recently published, and that is how this letter has come to light. This is what Lala Lajpat Rai, a very astute politician and a staunch Hindu Mahasabhite said—but before I read his letter, it is plain that you cannot get away from being a Hindu if you are Hindu. The word 'Nationalist' has now become the play of conjurers in politics. This is what he says :

"There is one point more which has been troubling me very much of late and one which I want you to think (about) carefully, and that is the question of Hindu-Mohammedan unity. I have devoted most of my time during the last six months to the study of Muslim history and Muslim law, and I am inclined to think it is neither possible nor practicable. Assuming and admitting the sincerity of Mohammedan leaders in the non-co-operation movement, I think their religion provides an effective bar to anything of the kind.

"You remember the conversation I reported to you in Calcutta which I had with Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr.

Kitchlew. There is no finer Mohammedan in Hindustan than Hakim Ajmal Khan, but can any Muslim leader override the Quran ? I can only hope that my reading of Islamic law is incorrect."

I think his reading is quite incorrect.

"And nothing would relieve me more than to be convinced that it is so. But if it is right, then it comes to this, that although we can unite against the British, we cannot do so to rule Hindustan on British lines. We cannot do so to rule Hindustan on democratic lines."

Ladies and gentlemen, when Lala Lajpat Rai said that we cannot rule this country on democratic lines it was all right, but when I had the temerity to speak the same truth about 18 months ago, there was a shower of attacks and criticism. But Lala Laipat Rai said 15 years ago that we cannot do so, *viz.*, rule Hindustan on democratic lines. What is the remedy ? The remedy according to the Congress is to keep us in the minority and under the majority rule. Lala Lajpat Rai proceeds further :

"What is then the remedy ? I am not afraid of the seven crores of Musalmans. But I think the seven crores in Hindustan plus the armed hosts of Afghanistan, Central Asia, Arabia, Mesopotamia and Turkey will be irresistible.

"I do honestly and sincerely believe in the necessity or desirability of Hindu-Muslim unity. I am also fully prepared to trust the Muslim leaders. But what about the injunctions of the Quran and the Hadis ? The leaders cannot override them. Are we then doomed ? I hope that your learned mind and wise head will find some way out of this difficulty."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, that is merely a letter written by one great Hindu leader to another great Hindu leader 15 years ago. Now, I should like to put before you my views on the subject, as it strikes me, taking everything into consideration at the present moment. The British Government and

Parliament, and more so the British nation, have been, for many decades past, brought up and nurtured with settled notions about India's future, based on developments in their own country which have built up the British constitution, functioning now through the Houses of Parliament and the Cabinet system. Their concept of party-government, functioning on political planes, has become the ideal with them as the best form of government for every country; and the one-sided and powerful propaganda which naturally appeals to the British has led them into a serious blunder, in producing a constitution envisaged in the Government of India Act of 1935. We find that the leading statesmen of Great Britain, saturated with these notions, have in their pronouncements seriously asserted and expressed a hope that the passage of time will harmonize the inconsistent elements in India.

A leading journal like the London *Times*, commenting on the Government of India Act of 1935, wrote, "undoubtedly the difference between the Hindus and Muslims is not of religion in the strict sense of the word, but also of low and culture, that they may be said indeed to represent two entirely distinct and separate civilizations. However, in the course of time the superstitions will die out, and India will be moulded into a single nation." So, according to the London *Times*, the only difficulties are superstitions. These fundamental and deep-rooted differences, spritual, economic, cultural, social and political, have been euphemized as mere 'superstitions'. But surely, it is a flagrant disregard of the past history of the subcontinent of India, as well as the fundamental Islamic conception of society, *vis-a-vis* that of Hinduism, to characterize them as mere 'superstitions'. Notwithstanding a thousand years of close contact, nationalities which are as divergent today as ever cannot at any time be expected to transform themselves into a one nation merely by means of subjecting them to a democratic constitution and holding them forcibly together by unnatural and artificial methods of British Parliamentary Statutes. What the unitary Government of India for 150 years had failed to achieve cannot be realized by the imposition of a central federal government. It is

inconceivable that the fiat or the writ of a government so constituted can ever command a willing and loyal obedience throughout the Subcontinent from various nationalities except by means of armed force behind it.

Autonomous National States

The problem in India is not of an inter-communal but manifestly of an inter-national character, and it must be treated as such. So long as this basic and fundamental truth is not realized, any constitution that may be built will result in disaster and will prove destructive and harmful not only to the Musalmans, but also to the British and Hindus. If the British Government are really in earnest and sincere to secure the peace and happiness of the people of this Subcontinent, the only course open to us all is to allow the major nations separate homelands, by dividing India into 'autonomous national States'. There is no reason why these States should be antagonistic to each other. On the other hand, the rivalry and the natural desire and efforts on the part of the one (community) to dominate the social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the government of the country will disappear. It will lead more towards natural goodwill by international pacts between them (the states) and they can live in complete harmony with their neighbours. This will lead further to a friendly settlement all the more easily with regard to minorities by reciprocal arrangements and adjustments between the Muslim India and the Hindu India, which will far more adequately and effectively safeguard the rights and interests of Muslims and various other minorities.

It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders. It is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone for beyond the limits, and is the cause of most

of our troubles, and will lead India to destruction, if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and the Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, and literature. They neither intermarry, nor interdine together, and indeed they belong to two different civilizations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Musalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, their heroes are different and they have different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other, and likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single State, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and the final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a State.

History has presented to us many examples, such as the Union of Great Britain and Ireland, of Czechoslovakia and Poland. History has also shown to us many geographical tracts, much smaller than the Subcontinent of India, which otherwise might have been called one country, but which have been divided into as many states as there are nations inhabiting them. The Balkan Peninsula comprises as many as seven or eight sovereign States. Likewise, the Portuguese and the Spanish stand divided in the Iberian Peninsula. Whereas under the plea of the unity of India and one nation, which does not exist, it is sought so pursue here the line of one Central Government, when we know that the history of the last 12 hundred years has failed to achieve unity and has witnessed, during the ages, India always divided into Hindu India and Muslim India. The present artificial unity of India dates back only to the British conquest and is maintained by the British bayonet; but the termination of the British regime, which is implicit in the recent declaration of His Majesty's Government, will be the herald of an entire break up, with worse disaster than has ever taken place during the last one thousand years under the Muslims. Surely that is not the legacy which British would bequeath to India after 150 years

of her rule, nor would the Hindu and Muslim India risk such a sure catastrophe.

Muslim India cannot accept any Constitution which must necessarily result in a Hindu majority Government. Hindus and Muslims brought together under a democratic system forced upon the minorities can only mean Hindu Raj. Democracy of the kind with which the Congress High Command is enamoured would mean the complete destruction of what is most precious in Islam. We have had ample experience of the working of the provincial Constitutions during the last two and a half years; and any repetition of such a Government must lead to civil war and raising private armies, as recommended by Mr. Gandhi to Hindus of Sukkur, when he said that they must defend themselves violently or non violently, blow for blow; and if they could not, they must emigrate.

Musalmans are not a minority, as it is commonly known and understood. One has only got to look round. Even to-day, according to the British map of India, 4 out of 11 provinces, where the Muslims dominate more or less, are functioning notwithstanding the decision of the Hindu Congress High Command to non-co-operate and prepare for civil disobedience. Musalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nation, and they must have their homelands, their territory and their State. We wish to live in peace and harmony with our neighbours as a free and independent people. We wish our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best, and in consonance with our own ideals and according to the genius of our people. Honesty demands—and the vital interests of millions of our people impose a sacred duty upon us to find—an honourable and peaceful solution which would be just and fair to all. But at the same time, we cannot be moved or diverted from our purpose and objective by threats or intimidations. We must be prepared to face all difficulties and consequences, make all the sacrifices that may be required of us to achieve the goal we have set in front of us.

Conclusion

Ladies and gentlemen, that is the task before us. I fear I have gone beyond my time limit. There are many things that I should like to tell you; but I have already published a little pamphlet containing most of the things that I have been saying, and I think you can easily get that publication, both in English and in Urdu, from the League Office. It might give you a clearer idea of our aims. It contains very important resolutions of the Muslim League and various other statements.[1]

Anyhow, I have placed before you the task that lies ahead of us. Do you realize how big and stupendous it is ? Do you realize that you cannot get freedom or independence by mere arguments ? I should appeal to the intelligentsia. The intelligentsia in all countries in the world have been the pioneers of any movements for freedom. What does the Muslim intelligentsia propose to do ? I may tell you that unless you get this into your blood, unless you are prepared to take off your coats and are willing to sacrifice all that you can, and work selflessly, earnestly and sincerely for your people, you will never realize your aim. Friends, I therefore want you to make up your minds definitely, and then think of devices, and organize your people, strengthen your organization and consolidate the Musalmans all over India. I think that the masses are wide awake. They only want your guidance and lead. Come forward as servants of Islam, organize the people economically, socially, educationally and politically, and I am sure that you will be a power that will be accepted by everybody.

1. ***India's Problem of her Future Constitution, with Preface by M.A. Jinnah***, p. 1-15.

14

A TIME-BOUND PLAN FOR MUSLIM INDIA*

Ladies and gentlemen, in the first place let me thank you and those who have made enquiries about my indisposition. I have received so many messages and calls that it is not possible for me to reply them personally either by wire or letter. But I hope that you will accept my heartfelt thanks and appreciation of your enquiries about my health.

We have got to take stock of our internal progress and the development of the organisation of the All-India Muslim League. I think you will remember that the first foundation of the revival of the All-India Muslim League was laid in April 1936 at Bombay—now almost exactly five years ago. During the five years passed and if I may call it our five year plan, we have, I think it will be admitted on all hands, succeeded in organising Muslim India from one end of India to the other in a remarkable manner. Since the fall of the Mughal empire. I think I am right in saying that Muslim India was never so well organised and so alive and so politically conscious as it is today.

Consolidation

We have established a flag of our own, a national flag of Muslim India. We have established a remarkable platform which displays and demonstrates a complete unity of the entire solid body of Muslim India. We have defined in the clearest language our goal about which Muslim India was groping in the dark, and the goal is Pakistan. In this effort of ours, let

* Presidential address delivered by M. A. Jinnah at the Madras Session held on 12-15 April, 1941.

me not forget to appreciate what South India has done. I know you had many difficulties in your progress. I have been in very close touch with almost all important districts of yours, not personally but by means of post and telegraph. I have watched, and I have watched with pride and pleasure, the way in which you have organized the Muslim League in South India. Yours has been a real growth, a growth not from the top but from the bottom, which only about a year ago brought the Muslim League into complete harmony throughout your Presidency. For this many have worked hard, and I believe I am in possession of reliable information and that I am not exaggerating or flattering you because I am in your Presidency —I am convinced, and I have information with regard to the whole of India, that the 7 per cent Muslims of this vast Presidency have organized themselves under the banner of the Muslim League as no other province has done.

New Five-Year Plan for Muslim India

That is our five-year plan of the past. We have succeeded in raising the prestige and reputation of the League not only throughout this country—we have now reached the farthest corners of the world, and we are watched throughout the world. Now what next? You must remember that we are now at the most critical time. You must remember that there are various forces in India and outside. No people can ever succeed in anything that they desire unless they work for it and work hard for it. What is required now is that you should think—and I say this particularly to you, Delegates of the All-India Muslim League who have gathered here from all parts of India—we must now think and devise the programme of a five-year plan, and part of the five-year plan should be how quickly and how best the departments of the national life of Muslim India may be built up. What are those departments? They are the four main pillars. (1) Let us devise a definite well-considered educational plan. It is knowledge, information and enlightenment that make a people great. (2) Next, you know the Muslims are left behind both economically and in the social life of the people of this great

land of ours—the Muslims are at the bottom compared to other communities. There is this great Province of Madras. May I know what stature the Muslims have in the economic life of this province ? May be, my knowledge is very poor, but I have been inquiring since my arrival here, and I have enquired before also, and I was told that the only two industries in which the Muslims were anywhere were those of hides and skins and of beedis—in other words, *beediwallahs* and *chamrewallahs* !

I ask you, are you going to be *beediwallahs* or *chamrewallahs*, or are you going to play your part in the commerce and improvement of this Presidency ?

(3) The next important thing is political training. While the Musalmans have made remarkable progress in the sense that they have brought millions of Musalmans under the banner of the Muslim League, while they have become politically conscious, while they have come to feel that they have acquired their self-respect, self-reliance, and the dignity and honour of their nation, they require thorough harnessing, consolidating and political training in a manner that will enable them to march along to their goal. What I want is that there should be lieutenants, majors, captains, colonels and generals, and just as there are soldiers in the army, we must have political soldiers. And these soldiers must be so well trained in political science that they should be prepared to face any emergency that might arise at any time.

Our decisions and our resolutions are misrepresented and misinterpreted, not that there should be any room for doubt left in the minds of any intelligent Indian—it does not matter to which community he belongs. Let me clarify our position with regard to our goal. What is the goal of the Muslim League ? What is the ideology of the All-India Muslim League ? Let me tell you as clearly as possible...the goal of the All-India Muslim League is as follows : we want the establishment of completely Independent States in the North-Western and Eastern Zones of India with full control of

Defence, Foreign Affairs, Communications, Customs, Currency, Exchange etc.; and we do not want, under the circumstances, a Constitution of an All-India character, with one Government at the Centre. We will never agree to that. If you once agree, let me tell you, the Muslims will be absolutely wiped out of existence. We shall never be a signatory to any power of Government at the Centre so far as the North-Western and Eastern Zones' free national homes are concerned. The leadership of Hindu India, I regret to say, are being fooled and being bamboozled by the policy and diplomacy of the British Government, who are dangling a united, all-India Constitution and democracy in front of them—two carrots before donkeys. The British Government know in fact, I say to the Hindu leadership, that you have lost the last shred of statesmanship, if you have not realized it yet. The British Government know that Muslim India will never submit to an All-India Constitution with one Central Government, and the British statesmen know that so far as democracy, the parliamentary system of government, is concerned, it is nothing but a farce in this country.

It is not, as some people mix it up, a question of Muslims objecting to a government which should be really based on the brotherhood of man, as it is very often said by people who really do not understand what they are talking about when they talk about democracy or when they talk about Islam. Democracy means, to begin with, majority rule. Majority rule in a single society is understandable, although even there it has failed. Representative government in a single nation, harmonious and homogeneous, in one society is understandable; but you have only got to apply your mind a few minutes : can such a system ever work or succeed when you have two different nations, more than two different nations ? In this Subcontinent you have two different societies, the Muslim society and the Hindu society—and particularly in this land, there is another nation, that is the Dravidian.

This land is really Dravidistan, and imagine its 3 per cent of Brahmin high castes, by skilful manoeuvring and by

skilful methods of electioneering, 3 per cent of them should secure a majority. Is this democracy or is this a farce? Therefore, I have the fullest sympathy and give my fullest support to the Non-Brahmins, and I say to them : The only way for you to come in to your own is to live your own life, according to your culture, according to your language—thank God, that Hindi did not go far here—according to your own history—go ahead. I have every sympathy and shall do all to help, and you can establish Dravidistan where the 7 per cent Muslim population will stretch its hands of friendship and live with you on lines of security, justice and fairplay.

Safeguards must be provided for wherever there is a minority. I have always believed and believe, I think I am right, that no government will ever succeed without instilling a sense of security and confidence in the minority. No government will suceed if their policy and programme would be unjust and unfair to the minorities. In no government must minorities feel that they will have no fairplay and justice. On that we shall not be wanting or lagging behind any civilized country in the world. And I am confident when the issue comes up, the minorities in our homeland will find that with our traditions and our heritage, with our teachings of Islam...not only shall we be fair and just to them but generous, too.

We will not higgle haggle. We do not believe in bargaining. We believe in action, we believe in statesmanship, and we believe in practical politics.

(4) The next thing I want to tell you is what the ideology of the League is. I think that it has been made clear. But I also think that there are people in this world who require repetition—especially a section of the Hindu press requires to be reminded over and over again, so that they may not go on misrepresenting us. And now let me say that the ideology of this League is based on the fundamental principle that Muslims of India are an independent nationality, and any attempt to get them to merge their national and political identity and unity will not only be resisted, but in my opinion

it will be futile for any one to attempt it. We are determined that there shall be no mistake in establishing the status of an independent nation and an Independent State in this Subcontinent.

The next thing I want to tell you about is our policy—internal, external and international. Our policy of the All-India Muslim League, is to endeavour to promote goodwill and harmony with the other peoples on the basis of equality, fairplay and receiprocity. These can best be secured by agreements with other peoples, parties and States, with the objective of collective security and orderly development of the peoples living in different States, as well as among free States as members of a community pledged to respect each other's rights. Any action of domination by one over the other must be abandoned— the sooner this is abandoned, the nearer will be the solution of India's problem. Now I have tried to tell you all I could, and in as clear a language as possible, about what we stand for.

The Deadlock

The next question that is troubling us to-day is what is known as a deadlock. Now let us examine it fairly as to who is responsible for this deadlock. The trouble in our country is that people have not the courage to speak out. They have not the courage openly to condemn one party or the other, while they claim to be impartial. I can understand, of course, one party blaming the other in its party zeal. But even there, there is a limit to taking; everything your party does is right, and everything any other party does is wrong. Who is to be blamed for this deadlock ?

You know perfectly well that from the commencement of the declaration of the war in which we were involved, whether we approved of it or not, whether we liked it or not, we were involved and we became a belligerent country. You know the events that are taking place day after day, week after week; and we are naturally fully conscious of the interest of our own country, the defence of our country—to safeguard our homes

and hearths is no doubt our uppermost consideration. From the beginning of the outbreak of war we made clear our position; and it is not my merely saying it, but it has been made clear by the Working Committee, the Council of the All-India Muslim League. and finally the full session of the All-India Muslim League. What was the position that we took up ? That may be described about as shortly as I can. When this war broke out, the first relief and good news, alongwith bad news of the war, that we got was that His Excellency the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow. in his very first interview immediately after the war started, told me that His Majesty's Government were pleased to suspend the All-India Federal Scheme, embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935.

Mind you it was only suspended; for we know how capable our British friends are in the science and game of diplomacy, and we know that what had been suspended may again be established at any time. Therefore, our first and foremost demand was that this should not only be suspend, but that it must be abandoned. After long-drawn correspondence and interviews, ultimately the British Government, through the Representative of the Crown, declared that the whole problem of India's Future Constitution will be considered *de novo*, including the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act of 1935 was based. Now that was indeed a great relief. Because, remember, it was that disruptive Federal Government embodied in the Act of 1935 which Muslim India, was fighting from its very commencement—and when that was knocked out, it was an enormous relief to us.

Well, the next thing that we were afraid of was that we the Muslims, were weak in the sense of our organization—the Muslim League, in spite of all its efforts, was not so strong as the Congress. The Congress, I may tell you, means nothing more, nothing less than the solid body of Hindus behind it—and other off-shoots and the little bodies and little *bachchas*, like the Hindu Mahasabha and the All-India Hindu League, Liberal Federation and other small little bits. They are all one. I do not say they are one in the sense that they necessarily

approve of the actions of the Congress, but really, if any body really represents Hindu India, it is the Congress.

In fact, you remember, when there was a likelihood of the war breaking out, the Congress Working Committee sat in vigilance at Delhi for days and days, because, as they were giving out openly, that would be the chance of their lives when they should be able to coerce the British Government and successfully wrench from them what they desired to take.

We knew that this powerful Congress organization was waiting and watching; and we, therefore, wanted the British to make the position clear—and this is the second point that I am discussing—with regard to the future Constitution of India. We demanded that no constitutional change, interim or final, should be made without the approval and consent of Muslim India. Well, after long-drawn correspondence and interviews, we now practically got it, as announced by the Viceroy's declaration of August 8, and amplified by Mr. Amery, Secretary of State, in his pronouncement on behalf of His Majesty's Government on August 14. When that was made clear, and it is but fair and just, what has it come to ? That no constitution, or no change in the Constitution, interim or final, should be made by the British Parliament without our approval and consent. What does it come to ? It comes to nothing else but fair justice to 90 milions of Muslims. Do Hindus or Congress maintain, with any sense of justice and fairplay, that the British Government are joining hands with us and conspiring against them, that they should frame a constitution which is acceptable to the British and Hindus, and that we should have to submit to it, and be forced into it. Is it not rank madness to say all that ? What does it mean ? 'This means a veto for the Muslim League and a charter of intransigence for Mr. Jinnah and the League'. But may I know what will be the other alternative ? I do not admit for a moment this is a veto. What is the other problem. Let us complete this. It does not mean that I have a veto in the ordinary constitutional sense of the word; it means that in the framing of a Constitution the Muslim League is a constituent factor, and that the constituent factor

must approve of the constitution that is to be made. How else are you going to frame a Constitution, without the approval and consent of a constituent factor, of 90 million or 100 million people of this country ? Are they to be ignored, neglected in the making of the Constitution ? Therefore, it is not a question of a veto or charter of intransigence, but it is fair justice that we are recognized as a constituent factor, and the British Government rightly say that we must come to our own agreement.

Mr. Jinnah then asked how the Hindus would like the British Government, in conspiracy with the Muslim League, to make a Constitution without the approval and consent of the Congress or the Hindus. Therefore, the second point was nothing but fair justice to Muslim India.

The Muslim League Position

The next thing is the war. It is really an overbearing and overriding factor to be considered. What is the position that the League should come to ?...

His Excellency the Viceroy asked me to go and see him in July 1940. This was the note submitted by me that no pronouncement or statements should be made by His Majesty's Government which would in any way militate against the basic and fundamental principles laid down by the Lahore Resolution for the division of India and creating Muslim States in the North-Western and Eastern Zones. It may be stated that the ideal has now become the universal faith of Muslim India. His Majesty's Government must give a definite and categorical assurance to the Muslims of India that no interim or final Constitution will be adopted by the British Government without the consent and approval of Muslim India. In view of the rapid developments in Europe, and of the grave danger that is facing India, it is fully realized that everything should be done that is possible to mobilize all resources of India for the purpose of maintaining internal security, peace and tranquillity, and to ward off external aggression. But this

can only be done provided the British Government are ready and willing to associate Muslim leadership as an equal partner in the Government, both at the Centre and in the Provinces. In all provinces Muslim leadership should be fully treated as an equal and with an equal share in the authority and control of the Government, Central and Provincial.

Provisionally, during the period of the war, the following steps should be taken to comply with the formal co-operation with Government, with an equal share in the authority of Government. Now I want you to follow this. What is it that we suggested in July 1940? Is it that the Executive Council of the Viceroy should be enlarged within the framework of the present Constitution and existing law? No, it should be settled by further discussion, it being understood that the Muslim representation be equal to that of the Hindus, if the Congress comes in; otherwise they should have the majority of the additional numbers, as it is obvious that the main burden and responsibility will be borne by the Muslims in that case. Then we said that in the Provinces where Section 93 operates, non-official advisers should be appointed. The number, should be fixed after discussion, and the majority of the non-official advisers should be the representatives of Muslims. Where Provinces can be run by a combination of parties, naturally it will be for the parties concerned to adjust the matter by agreements. Then we suggested a war council which was mainly intended to give a share and a place of status to the Indian Princes and States for the purpose of intensifying war efforts and prosecuting the war successfully, because it would not come in the Executive Council of the Governor-General.

Congress Propaganda

Let us compare what our Congressmen say. The Congress Press and some Congressmen are often saying that Muslims are friends of imperialism. It seems to me that when they do not find any argument to adduce against the claims of the Musalmans, they abuse us. They either say, 'you are friends of imperialism', or that Mr. Jinnah is very ambitious?

Though in his heart he is a nationalist, he has now become a communalist, because he wants leadership'. So they attributed motives and began to abuse us. If you put any decent statement or argument before them, then the Hindu press comes out with big headlines and describes them as 'Jinnah's Tirades', 'Muslim League's Fulmination'. The moment you do not agree or have the misfortune to take some other view in the best interests of India, you are at once put down with abuse. What can you do with a class of people who have developed this diseased mentality ?

Did we say anywhere that we should have Pakistan here and now ? But people were not wanting who misinterpreted things and said, 'The Pakistan issue is postponed—it is now put aside.' This is nothing but wishful thinking on the part of those who have put their feet so deep in the mire that they now want to find some excuse to impute a change upon a party which had never changed from the very beginning. Why not say honestly and frankly that you have committed a blunder, that you are also willing to come into line, and be done with it ?

British Ingratitude and Vacillation

But this vicious propaganda and wicked method being pursued, and the way in which we are harassed, is not only affecting the press and the public of this country; to my amazement and astonishment, even the British Press in misled, amongst them, one of the best informed papers, the London *Times*, the flower of British Newspapers. To my utter astonishment, this is what it says. I quote a few lines from the London *Times* of April 1 —which is a fool's day, and it has been fooled—, "While these proposals encountered much opposition in various quarters, it is significant that the most general press comment on them is that they offer a fresh opportunity for re-examining the political situation. Mr. Jinnah's recent statement in the Central Assembly that the Muslim League would co-operate in the reconstituted Executive, provided his scheme of partitioning British India is considered

after the war, may make it easier for the two chief Indian parties to reach some temporary understanding."

Well, I can only say to the dozen of British newspapers that this is only ingratitude stronger than the traitor's arms. Why do we not make the demand for Pakistan here and now ? For only one reason; because we do not want to embarrass the British Government when they are engaged in a struggle of life and death for their own existence. That is why we said that so soon as circumstances permit, or when the whole problem of India's Constitution should be examined *de novo*. Instead of the British Government acknowleging this as an honourable attitude on our part, worthy of our tradition, I find that even the British papers are playing into the hands of the Congress and the Hindu propaganda I say 'the British Government', but do not know who is responsible—His Excellency the Viceroy, the Secretary of State for India, or His Majesty's Government, or whether it is the Parliament or the King.

I may once again emphatically say from this platform that the policy of the British Government in India of inaction, of weakness, and of vacillation is going to prove more disastrous than it has done even in Europe.

Let me say that events are moving fast and maps have been changed in Europe. Look at the map. What has happened ? What the Axis powers have done is action, action against the policy of the British Government. What's the British Government doing : placating and placating by following the policy of inaction vacillation and weakness. To my amazement, you find only two days ago what has happened Yugoslavia—the announcement in the paper following the German capture of Zagreb in Yugoslavia : the Province of Croatia has been made an independent State, says the official news agency. The statement was from the Zagreb wireless. A Croat general called a good lot of officials, non-officials, army officers and non-commissioned officers to take the oath of allegience to a new State—the Province of Croatia is

declared an independent State. Remember there in Yugoslavia you have the Croats, the Slavs, the Serbs. The position was very much like our position in India—Dravidistan, Pakistan and Hindustan. The question really is 'Are you going to act or allow somebody else to come here and do the job for you ?' What are you going to do now ?

Let us examine what the Congress wants. The Congress has taken up a position about which there is absolutely no doubt. I should like to ask any man with a grain of sense, 'Do you really think that Gandhi, the supreme leader, commander and general of the Congress, has started this Satyagraha merely for the purpose of getting liberty of speech ? Don't you really feel that this is nothing but a weapon of coercion and blackmailing the British, who are in a tight corner, to surrender and concede the Congress demands ?'

The Congress Demand and its Flanking Movement

What are the demands of the Congress ? The demand is the declaration of immediate and unconditional independence and freedom of India, with power to the people of India through a Constituent Assembly to be elected by adult franchise to frame their own constitution—of course, also to the satisfaction of the minorities. How that will be brought about, Heaven alone knows ! I don't know. This was the demand of the Congress; and when they found it was not going to wash (the British Government ought to be grateful to the Muslim League for saving them the maximum amount of trouble the Congress was determined to give them, and I believe that in their heart of hearts the British people were grateful to the Muslim League), they thought of a flanking movement.

The Muslims know that if the Congress demand is conceded, it will mean complete destruction of the Muslims. Therefore, naturally the Muslim League opposed it tooth and nail along with other minorities like the Scheduled Castes, Christians, etc. Mr. Gandhi and his Congressmen did not know what to do.

The result was that Mr. Gandhi and the Congress found, to their unexpected astonishment, a strong opposition to the Congress demand. So the Congress thought that if they could not get what they wanted by a frontal attack, they should try a flanking movement.

What was the flanking movement ? I say, another resolution. As soon as the Congress passed a resolution, there would be commentators and interpreters. The explanation of the making of a resolution would go on for weeks and weeks; and by the time the commentators had finished, yards and yards of statements would have been issued.

They went from Poona to Delhi, Delhi to Bombay, and Bombay to Wardha.

So when they found that the Muslim League was the power which was holding up their diabolical machinations, they tried the flanking movement at Poona, in the place of the frontal attack. The change in Poona was only a change in name. The flanking movement was a plan and a strategy which was designed at Poona under the great General, because Mr. Jinnah did not believe that Mr. Gandhi was not a party to it. The Congress was willing to throw overboard the General, Mr. Gandhi, provided the British Government would do this, namely, make a declaration of immediate independence, and the freedom of India unconditionally, and the Future Constitution, the Final Constitution, to be framed after the war—but the Provisional Constitution should be a National Government, at the Centre, responsible to the Legislature. That was the Poona proposal, and Mr. Gandhi, of course, was thrown overboard. And Mr. Kripalani, Secretary of the All-India Congress Committee, said that they went to the length of selling their leader. They sold their leader, and *Ahimsa*, which was their creed, was also buried in the City of Poona, because the Congress was ready to assist the British in the prosecution of the war and the defence of India. What was *Haram* at Wardha, as we say, became *Halal* at Poona !

The Congress found that this was not going to wash

either, because nobody was going to be deceived by this sort of thing. They were only deceiving themselves.

This was followed by the 'sporting offer' of Mr. Rajagopalachari, that genius of your Province who does some wonderful things at times. He said that in this National Government that we are proposing, we are willing that Mr. Jinnah be the Prime Minister of the new cabinet and let him form his own cabinet as he likes. This new strategy on the part of the Congress once more failed to deceive the Muslims.

This was done with a view to deceiving the Muslim League, which they considered was the only body that was holding up their (Congress) game. Nobody would be deceived by such things. Even a Muslim boy understands these things now. Ladies and gentlemen, you see the point. I really do not know what has happened to their brains. They have in the past been successful with these methods. Why don't they realize that nothing of this sort is going to wash, and you cannot go on fooling all people for all time. It is the Congress and the Congress alone which has adopted the attitude of—sometimes dictation, sometimes cajoling, sometimes fooling and bamboozling, sometimes trying to deceive you.

A Plea for Honesty

I say to the Congress leaders and the Hindu leaders, 'Please drop these methods.' To illustrate the way in which responsible Congressmen speak :

Babu Rajendra Prasad was asked only a few days ago (April 10) about the Pakistan scheme. He said the Working Committee of the Congress never discussed the Pakistan scheme as that was never referred to it by Mr. Jinnah. Do you believe that the Working Committee of the Congress never discussed the scheme ? This ghost (Pakistan) has been haunting them since March 1940. What standard of truth is this ?

Every Congress leader, heading with Mr. Gandhi, had discussed, issued statements and written volumes about

Pakistan. Babu Rajendra Prasad has actually issued a pamphlet with regard to the Pakistan seheme, in which he came out with his view; and he says it was never discussed by the Working Committee because Mr. Jinnah never referred it. I say to Babu Rajendra Prasad, 'Ask your Working Committee to discuss it, if they have not already done so', I say, 'Do not only discuss it, but apply your mind to it honestly and without prejudice and without silly sentiment, if there is any political wisdom or statesmanship still left in the Congress leadership.' This is so far as the Congress is concerned.

So far as the Hindu Mahasabha is concerned, I think it is an absolutely incorrigible and hopeless organization. I will give you one specimen of their statesmanship. Mr. Savarkar, President of the Hindu Mahasabha, has sent a message to the Sikh Conference in Karachi in which he urged them to take their due share in arms and defence, and added later that when the Muslims wake up from their daydreams of Pakistan, they shall see Sikhistan established in the Punjab.

Mr. Savarkar says : "When the Sikhs were but a handful, they ruled the majority in the Punjab, and right up to Kabul. Now they have grown into millions, they can never be and need not be overawed by the now reduced Muslim majority, relatively to their former strength." Mr. Savarkar has urged the Sikhs to establish Sikhistan in the Punjab. He not only talks of Hindudom and Hindu Nation and Hindu Raj, but he also urges upon the Sikhs to establish Sikhistan Mr. Savarkar is not an ordinary man. He is the President of the Hindu Mahasabha.

I next refer to what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's paper has written on March 30. The paper said : "On two things there shall never be any division of India to suit the ambitions of fanatics. It shall always be *Akhand Bharat* (united India) and *Vishal Bharat* (Great India). It should be a democracy, meaning majority rule."

These are only samples to show how the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha leaders think. When we talk about

Pakistan, we are called fanatics; but when they talk about Hindudom, Hindu Raj for the whole of India, they are liberals and they are nationalists. The only pity is that the Hindu public is being deceived by this kind of leadership, and it will be too late for the Hindu public to say that they were helpless. So long as they follow that leadership they can not escape from their responsibilities and the consequences which will follow.

The Sapru Conference at Bombay

Now let me say a few words about the Sapru Conference which met at Bombay. I read in the papers this morning that Mr. Savarkar and the Working Committee of the Hindu Mahasabha had repudiated and disowned the Conference. It was mentioned in the memorandum of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru that the Conference included the leaders of the Hindu Mahasabha, but Mr. Savarkar has disowned that. I think Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, on his admission, has been a political orphan for a very long time. This political orphan has been caught in the trap.

He thinks that in the event of supreme danger to India, he alone, as the supreme intellect in India, can save India. His motives may be good, his intentions may be good, but I am afraid that the Sapru Conference was like the Dutch Army, all Generals and no privates. I think the correct answer and lead was given in that Conference by the clear-headed, experienced Hindu political leader, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, and if only Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru had followed his advice, he would have saved himself. What shall I say to this pose which is now thrust upon him by the wire pullers from behind. The Bombay proposals are nothing less than another name, another flanking movement and a second edition of the Poona proposals for a National Government. If you read the memorandum, there can be no doubt left. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru is entirely on the wrong line, and I am sorry that he has been caught in this trap by the wire-pullers of other organizations behind this movement.

Warning to British Government

I think I have taken much more of your time than I thought I would. I think I can wind up by a note, a note of real warning to the British Government, because after all they are in possession of this land and the Government of this Subcontinent. Please stop your policy of appeasement towards those who are bent upon frustrating your war efforts and doing their best to oppose the prosecution of the war and the defence of India at this critical moment. Do you want at this moment to put them or place them in a superior and dominant position now and after the war? Change the corner-stone of your (British) policy in this country? You are not loyal to those who are willing to stand by you and sincerely desire to support you; you desire to placate those who have the greatest nuisance value in the political and economic fields. Give up this dominant feature of your policy and the character of your policy of trying to get on with those who do not want to get on with you.

If the Government want the whole-hearted co-operation of Muslim India, they must place their cards on the table. The Government must resort to the policy of action, and give up, once and for all, its policy of inaction.

Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot always succeed in settling vital or grave problems, problems affecting life and death, merely by making speeches on this platform or by exposing our opponents and our enemies. The only weapon that you have to forge—and the sooner you forge it the better—is to create your own strength, your own power, and make your organization so complete that you can face any danger, any power, any opponents, any enemy singly or combined together.

15

CASE OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE MUSLIMS*

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you very sincerely for the great reception that you gave me at the station. I am proud to see that every month, every year, the Muslim League is going forward by leaps and bounds. I also thank the All-India Muslim League that they have honoured me by electing me as president for the year. I congratulate all the workers and office-bearers who have toiled and worked from day to day for the last three months in making all these preparations that we see here. Let me tell you that as we are growing in our strength, we are growing in our power of organising and managing our affairs better and better every day.

Now I wish to tell you and want to pick up the thread since we met at Madras last year in our annual session. At Madras we defined our policy, we defined our ideology, we defined our programme, and I appeal to everyone of you kindly to read that speech of mine and again study it not only study it, but I appeal to everyone of you that you should make some beginning in one direction or other with regard to the programme and policy that we have laid down. I donot want to go on repeating things. There was a time when it was necessary to repeat things to make our people and those who opposed us, understand us. The propaganda of the League and the literature and the meetings and conferences that are being held throughout India, our press and even our opponents' press have enlightened us now as to what the real issues are before us.

* Presidential address delivered by M.A. Jinnah at the Allahabad session held on 3-6 April, 1942.

Less Talk, More Work

Now let us talk less and work more. Not only that; but the grave international situation and the war that is now on our very borders, and almost at our gates—that must force us to realize how grave the danger is in front of us, and we do not know what is going to happen.

But, ladies and gentlemen, I must earnestly appeal to you. Musalmans organize yourselves to meet all eventualities whatever may happen. These are obvious truths that I am telling you; and I really don't think that I should now go on labouring the point because, in my judgment, to pick up the analogy, you are no longer infants, you have reached the age of discretion, and can act according. On that point I shall say no more.

The Cripps Mission

I know that the uppermost subject which is today not only engaging the attention of all India, but is also engaging the attention of the whole world, in the mission of Sir Stafford Cripps on behalf of His Majesty's Government. You have been following it from day to day. Now I want to tell you as far as it is possible for me, and explain to you as shortly as I can, this draft declaration of proposals. Mark the words that it is a draft declaration. These are proposals which have emanated from His Majesty's Government, and they have come to the conclusion that they are "just and final". Let us examine them and let us understand them. I am not going into details; I am going to pick up the main points.

The main points that emerge from this document are as follows. First, the object is the creation of a new Indian Union which shall constitute a Dominion associated with the United Kingdom and other Dominions by common allegiance to the Crown, but equal to them in every respect and is no way subordinate in any aspect of its domestic or external affairs. Here there may be some doubts as to the functions and the powers. There are three things—first status, then comes power

and finally functions. But that is a matter which will have to be considered when we come to the signing of a treaty or treaties with one Dominion or two Dominions or more.

The next point that emerges is this. Immediately upon the cessation of hostilities, steps shall be taken to set up in India, in the manner described here-after, and elected body charged with the task of framing a new Constitution for India. So we shall have an elected body charged with the task of framing a new Constitution. I shall deal with it when I come to the clause which lays down how that Constitution-making body will be set up and how it will be compound.

Third, there is a provision for the fortification of the Indian States.

Fourth, His Majesty's Government undertake to accept and implement forthwith the Constitution so framed. But subject to this, there are exceptions.

The first exception is the right of any British Indian province that is not prepared to accept the new Constitution to retain its present constitutional position, provision being made for its subsequent accession if it so decides. That is to say, the Constitution-making body, when it completes the framing of the constitution and when that Constitution, so framed, emerges from the deliberations of the Constitution-making body—which will be, remember, a sovereign body—then it would be open for any province or provinces to say, "we are not in agreement with this Constitution, and therefore we are not prepared to accede to this Constitution." But the most vital point and the most important of all the points, so far as we are concerned particularly, is as to how that province or provinces will express their will and exercise their right. And that is not in the document. But a suggestion has been thrown out by Sir Stafford Cripps, and the suggestion is that if a province, in the Legislative Assembly of the province, is in favour of accession by 60 per cent votes, then there will be an end of it. It means that the province is bound to accede. But if they get 59 per cent votes and the minority happens to be 41 per

cent, then there will be a plebiscite of the people of the province. Then of course, the non-acceding provinces can, among themselves, by the same process, form another Union or a Dominion, or any single province may stand by itself as a Dominion. That is the corollary.

Then comes the provision for treaty—the treaty or treaties which will have to be signed and made with the Dominion or Dominions that may be set up as well as with the Indian States acceding or not acceding.

I told you that I would refer to the actual clauses of the proposals and how the Constitution-making body will be set up or formed, and the provision is this. Immediately upon the end of hostilities, the Constitution-making body shall be composed as follows, unless leaders of the principal communities agree to some other machinery before the end of the hostilities. So at the end of the hostilities the Constitution-making body will be composed by this method : "Immediately upon the results being known of the provincial elections which would be necessary at the end of the hostilities, the entire membership of the lower Houses of all Provincial Legislatures shall as a single electoral college proceed to elect the Constitution-making body by the system of proportional representation. This new body shall be in number about one-tenth of the number of the electoral colleges." Therefore, I think, you understand that all the members of the Assemblies of 11 provinces will meet together as one single electoral college, and they will be roughly 1,600 members, and they will be entitled to elect one-tenth, which means, in all, 160 members by means of proportional representation. That is the Constitution-making body.

After that we come to the Indian States who will be invited to send their representatives, and the number will be according to their population. But how they will be chosen it is not mentioned at all in this document—whether by nomination or some method of election. Now, gentlemen, this is the document so far as the future is concerned.

But then there is a provision for the present also and that provision is this. While during the critical period which now faces India and until the new Constitution can be framed, His Majesty's Government must inevitably bear the full responsibility for the defence of India; they desire and invite the effective and immediate participation of the leaders of the principal sections of the Indian people in the counsels of their country, of the commonwealth and of the United Nations. Thus they will be enabled to give their active and constructive help in the discharge of a task which is vital and essential for the future freedom of India. The important words, ladies and gentlemen, are that the responsibility for the defence of India will be that of His Majesty's Government, and the leaders of the principal sections of the Indian people will be invited in the counsels of their country.

This was the original wording, but later on it was modified in this way : "During the critical period which now faces India and until the new Constitution might be framed, His Majesty's Government must inevitably bear the responsibility for and retain the control and direction of the defence of India as a part of their world war effort." But this is a change in the wording.

The task of organizing to the full the military, moral and material resources of India must be the responsibility of the Government of India with the co-operation of the people of India. Then they say that His Majesty's Government desire "to invite the effective participation of the leaders of the principal sections in the counsels of their country."

What the Document Means

Now, ladies and gentlemen, that is the document, and let me put in a few words what it means and how I understand it. It means, whatever may be the constitutional implications of the status and the powers of the Dominion or the Dominions that may be set up, the main objective is the creation of a new Indian Union. We start with that. For that purpose a Constitution-making body will be set up which will be the

sovereign body. A sovereign body will start—to use the language of Sir Stafford Cripps—with a preference for an All-India Union.

Think what will be the composition of that body. The composition of that body would be that first of all it will be elected from amongst the members of the 11 Assemblies meeting together as one college and by means of proportional representation, not separate electorates. When that body is formed, I cannot conceive how they can come to any other conclusion except the Union; and that is why it is so composed.

But after the Constitution-making body has framed its Constitution by a bare majority, it is true that any single province or provinces who do not approve of that Constitution are given a chance to go through another test which I shall explain hereafter. But remember that, at the most, Musalmans, even by separate electorates, will not be more than 25 per cent; but by the system of proportional representation, they might be less in number in the Constitution-making body. So the overwhelming majority will be non-Muslim and, therefore, the probabilities are contemplated that the Constitution may by a majority be in favour of only one Union.

The other point which is not there is : Will the decision of this Constitution-making body be taken by a bare majority or not ? Reading that document, as I do, clearly it cannot be anything else, because it is the accepted rule of every document that when we want to lay down a specific majority we state so. If you do not so state, then it means the rule of a bare majority. For instance, in our own Constitution we have the clause that our Constitution cannot be changed except by a majority of two-thirds. So that is the Constitution-making body. If I may comment on this a little, Mr. Gandhi will come to this Constitution-making body with a dead certainty of getting a Constitution which will emerge for an All-India Union.

Now when that is done, the province or provinces which would feel unhappy are given the consolation, 'No no, you

have yet another chance before you are killed.' And what is that chance ? The chance is this, and it is not in the document but a suggestion of Sir Stafford Cripps (of course, various suggestions have been made; we shall also make our suggestions when the time comes; but at 'present he has made a suggestion) : He says, 'Look here, if 41 per cent are against it then a plebiscite.' Whose plebiscite ? Of course, the plebiscite of the province.

Whose self-determination do you want to ascertain ? Self-determination of the two nations put together or one nation alone ? The answer is, of course, of both together.

That is another chance; and if you get the plebiscite in your favour then at least you will escape the slaughter-house before our *qurbani* is made. This is a point of the most vital character so far as Muslim India is concerned.

Recognition of Principles of Pakistan and Muslim Self-Determination

Then with regard to the present, gentlemen, I can tell you nothing except what is contained in this document; because it entirely depends on as to what will be the final picture, and I cannot throw any light on it. I have explained to you, and I hope correctly, and if I am not correct I shall certainly stand corrected by Sir Stafford Cripps or anybody else. After explaining the draft declaration of the proposals, I think I am echoing your feelings when I say that the Musalmans feel deeply disappointed that the entity and integrity of the Muslim nation has not been expressly recognized.

Any attempt to solve the problem of India by the process of evading the real issues and by over-emphasizing the territorial entity of the provinces, which are mere accidents of British policy, and administrative division is fundamentally wrong. Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the right of national self-determination is unequivocally recognized.

It must be realized that India was never a country or a

nation. India's problem is international in this subcontinent and differences—cultural, social, political and economic—are so fundamental that they cannot be covered up, concealed or confused, but must be handled by all as realists.

The alleged power of the minority in the matter of secession suggested in the document is illusory, as Hindu India will dominate the decision in favour of one All-India Union in all the provinces, and the Muslims in Bengal and the Punjab will be at the mercy of the Hindu minority in those provinces, who will exert themselves to the fullest extent and length for keeping the Musalmans tied to the chariot wheel of Hindudom. Thus the Musalmans will be doomed to subjection in all the provinces.

We cannot barter away, with our consent, the future for the present, while fully realizing the danger of foreign aggression, and notwithstanding all our anxieties to defend India and to help the prosecution of war. To do so will be a crime on our part to posterity and generations of hundreds of millions of Muslims to come.

As regards the proposals relating to the immediate adjustments in the Central and Provincial Governments, which we are told must be considered within the framework of the existing Constitution, it is difficult to gather from the document anything definite and concrete; for it must necessarily depend upon the full picture when it is disclosed. It is not known to us, nor is it before us yet. The document is a bare skeleton of the proposals, and obviously requires a lot of filling in and adjusting before it can be made acceptable; and it is one of those cases where the details will become more vital than the bare statement of certain principles.

It has roused our deepest anxieties and grave apprehensions, especially with reference to the Pakistan scheme, which is a matter of life and death for Muslim India We will, therefore, endeavour that the principle of Pakistan—which finds only veiled recognition in the document—should be conceded in unequivocal terms, so that we know how the right

of Musalmans to keep out or accede thereto is defined to our satisfaction. We do not wish to see that the history of Palestine should be repeated as it was after the last war, after we have paid for the promises in blood, money and material.

The document shows that Pakistan is treated as a remote possibility, and there is a definite preference for a new Indian Union, which is the main objective and suggestion; and the rules of procedure and the process indicated in the document, and the interview and explanations of Sir Stafford Cripps so far, are against us, and we are called upon to play the game with loaded dice.

Our Working Committee is engaged, as you know, since March 27 in the task of a most careful and searching examination of these proposals. I trust that in order to give real effect to the principles of Pakistan and Muslim self-determination, His Majesty's Government and Sir Stafford Cripps will not hesitate to make the necessary adjustments on their behalf. Let us hope that there will emerge out of these negotiations a settlement that will be just, honourable and finally acceptable to all.

16

MARCH FORWARD FOR PAKISTAN*

Delegates of the All-India Muslim League, ladies and gentlemen : I thank you heartily for having once more elected me as the President of the All-India Muslim League. It is an honour that to-day any man may envy and covet. I hope in the coming year I shall be able with your co-operation and support, to guide the course, policy and programme of the All India Muslim League. In the first instance, I would like to give you a report and tell you what developments have taken place as far as the internal affairs of the All-India Muslim League are concerned.

Bengal Affairs

Ladies and gentlemen, in the course of this one year since we met last at Allahabad, there is not the slightest doubt, that the Muslim League is moving from strength to strength throughout India.

In Bengal you know that we have suffered for the last 16 months It was our misfortune that even amongst our own ranks, our own people were made the spearhead of treachery who betrayed the Muslim interests. I think, it is now settled beyond doubt during the last 15 months the Muslims of Bengal have organized themselves in a manner which they had never before, at any time in the history of Bengal. They were persecuted and the Chief Minister, who I am ashamed to say was a Musalman . . . Ladies and gentlemen, if I were to give you

---

* Presidential address delivered by M. A. Jinnah at the Delhi Session held on 24-26 April, 1943.

an account of to what extent this Ministry headed by Fazlul Huq stooped—no decent human being could ever stoop to the foul methods he adopted. But I congratulate the Musalmans of Bengal, and in this I give a very great share of the credit to the Muslim youth of Bengal. . . Well, we had a pointer some months ago in the Natore election. The candidate that was put forward by our opponents against our candidate, I am happy to say, forfeited his security. In every bye-election we won, and in the last one in the Upper House, we won cent per cent. This tyranny, this persecution, this manoeuvring, these machinations in utter disregard of elementary principles of justice and fairplay, were resorted to by an organized Government headed by Mr. Fazlul Huq.

Thus we have gone through the crucible of fire in Bengal. And to-day Fazlul Huq is no more, and I hope for the rest of his life he will be no more. He often said that if he was a hindrance, he was willing to go. But he never went. I say with all due deliberation and with all responsibility that he was not only a hindrance but a curse to the politics of Bengal. He was a curse to the Musalmans because he betrayed us; he was a curse to the Hindus because he served them as a puppet and their creature. He has met his Waterloo. Let him now remain in St. Helena and repent for the rest of his life, and pray to God so that He may forgive his sins.

Bengal has therefore shown that there is no room for duplicity. Bengal has set an example from which others may learn a lesson. It is now the voice of the League, the voice of the people, it is now the authority of the Millat that you have to bow to, though you may be the tallest poppy in the Muslim world.

I am glad—although, I do not think that we need indulge in great exultation—that the Muslim League Party is running the Ministry in Assam. The Chairman of the Reception Commitee very rightly announced that the Muslim League Ministry —or the dominant Muslim League Party is running the Ministry in Assam. Similarly, the League has now formed a

Ministry in Bengal, and so in Sind and the Punjab. But now while we approve of it, do not run away with the idea that we have won and that is all that we wanted. This is only the starting point and it is not that we are ready and willing to make all sacrifices for the Ministries, we expect the Ministries to make all the sacrifices for us. So long as the Ministries remain within the orbit of the fundamental principles and the policy of the League, they shall certainly have our support. But I want to make it clear once more that the time has now come when we shall not hesitate to withdraw our support from any Ministry that does not follow the League principles. I have told you about Bengal.

Sind, N.W.F.P and the Punjab

Now let me tell you that you will find that in Sind to-day —believe me, I am not exaggerating—almost 99 per cent of the Musalmans are with the League, and the League is being organized there in a manner which, really, if you were to follow, you would not believe how the progress has been made. In the North-West Frontier Province (It is the only Muslim province which remains to-day under section 93), my information is—and it is based on very reliable sources—that within the last 16 or 18 months the Muslim public is entirely with the Muslim League. This information is based not on our agents or other people, but it is based further upon the testimony of foreign correspondents who have been there and examined the situation.

Similar is the position in the Punjab. But I regret to say that the Punjab has not yet played the part that it ought to play and is entitled to play—because, remember, the Punjab is the cornerstone of Pakistan. I particularly appeal to the delegates from the Punjab—people are all right in the Punjab —when you go back, please—I won't say anything more— please substitute the love of Islam and your nation in the place of sectional interests, jealousies, tribal notions and selfishness. For these evils have overpowered you and you are being ground down for the last 200 years. But I see a light—

a very bright light. Because, I say, when I went to the Punjab in November last, throughout my tour, it really made me happy to see that the solid body of the people were all right and sound. My appeal is to the leaders—and we have got very able men, very capable men. If they were to make up their minds, I feel confident that within six months the face of the Punjab would be changed. Well, I have told you roughly, and in some way, what the position of the League in these majority provinces is.

Minority Provinces

Don't forget the Minority Provinces. It is they who have spread the light when there was darkness in the majority Provinces. It is they who were the spearheads that the Congress wanted to crush with their overwhelming majority in the Muslim Minority Provinces. It is they who had suffered for you in the Majority Provinces, for your sake, for your benefit and for your advantage. But never mind, it is all in the role of a minority to suffer. We of the minority have suffered and are ready to face any consequences if we can liberate the 75 million of our brethren in the North, Western and Eastern Zones.

We have got a great deal to do, Of course, it has now been made clear as to what we are struggling for. To anyone who now pretends that he does not understand, well, what shall I say ? He is a fool or a dishonest man. Our goal is clear; our demands are clear. What is it that we want ? We want to establish independent States in those zones which are our homelands and where we are in a majority. In other words, we do not want to be in union with those zones where the Hindus are in a majority and the Musalmans are in a minority. Now let me give you some idea of the background of the movement in India for the independence of India.

In Retrospect

In the first instance, the Act of 1861 and the Act of 1884 gave a very small kind of representation to the so-called

Councils of the Governors and the Governor-General. If you will remember, a small beginning was made with elected representatives being sent either to the Imperial Councils, as it was then called, or the local councils, or to other municipal or local or district boards in the country. The result of the working of the Act was—I am not exaggerating—that it was not possible for any Musalman to get elected. Then came the Minto-Morley proposals in 1907, the first time that this elective principle was seriously going to be enlarged or increased. At that time, the Musalmans, who had learnt by their experience from 1884 onwards, right up to 1907, made a demand for separate electorates. Mr. Gokhale, who was a great Hindu (and I was quite a young man at that time, one who had learnt at the feet of that great man,) and Dadabhai Naoroji naturally came to imbibe certain principles, one of which was that we must try to bring about an equitable adjustment between these two major communities in this land. Mr. Gokhale at that time championed the cause of the Musalmans. With his liberal and broad-minded statesmanship, he was a tower of intellect, and this is what he said in 1907 :

> "Confronted by an overwhelming Hindu majority, Muslims are naturally afraid that release from the British yoke might in their case mean enslavement to the Hindus. (This is not a fear to be ridiculed). Were the Hindus similarly situated as are the Muslims in regard to numbers and other things, would they not have entertained similar misgivings ? We would undoubtedly have felt the same fears and adopted the identical policy which the Muslims are adopting today."

It is men of the character of that great Dadabhoy Naoroji that inspired us with some hope of a fair and equitable adjustment. But remember, even at this period there were signs that there was a section which was dreaming in terms of Hindu Raj. I give you one quotation from a prominent Hindu leader—Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal. You will see that even as far back as 1913 that was the definite aim of a large section of the Hindus. This is what Mr. Pal says in May 1913.

"National differentiations among us, therefore, have not been based upon territorial demarcations only or upon political or economic competitions and conflicts, but upon differences of culture. Under the Muslims we had, whether Hindus or Musalmans, one common Government, but that did not destroy the integrity of Hindu culture. We took many things from our Mohammedan neighbours, and gave them also something of our own; but this interchange of ideas and institutions did not destroy our special character or our special culture. And that special character and culture is the very soul and essence of what we now understand as nationalism. This is by no means a mere political idea or deal. It is something that touches every department of our collective life and activity. It is organized in our domestic, our communal, our social and our socio-economic institutions. In fact politics form, from some points of view, the least important factor of this nation-idea among us. The so-called free political institutions of Europe might, indeed, hinder, instead of helping, the growth of our real national life, while under conceivable conditions, mere political subjection might not be able to touch even the outermost fringe of that life."

Then he goes on :

"The Nationalist Movement in India, which so far is essentially a Hindu movement, stands :

I. Ideally, for (i) Hindu Nationalism (ii) Federal Internationalism (iii) Universal Federation.

II. Practically, for (i) the preservation of the distinctive genius and character of Hindu culture and civilization, (ii) the promotion of sympathetic and reverent study of other world-cultures—e.g. Christian and Islamic—representing the composite of modern India, and the cultivation of the spirit of mutual understanding and helpful co-operation with them, (iii) the continuance of the British connection through the gradual building up of a Federal Constitution for the present association called the British

Empire, a Federation in which India and Egypt shall be equal co-partners of Great Britain with Ireland and the British colonies, (iv) the advancement of Universal Federation."

He stands for what? Hindu Nationalism. But as I say, undaunted, hope sprang almost eternally in my heart and soul, derived from Dadabhai Naoroji. I was not going to give it up, but nourish it. After the Karachi Session of the Congress in 1913, I redoubled my efforts. What happened? Those of you who remember it know it was our set purpose to remove this misunderstanding. There were many others who were a pillar of strength amongst the Musalmans as well as the Hindus who made great efforts. I was the arch-culprit in this mission. I therefore tried—and succeeded—to get these two organisations, the Congress and the Muslim League, to meet at least in one city. That was in 1915. It was after laborious efforts that I got them together in the city of Bombay. At that time, as it happened, the war was on; and it was expected that the Government would make some declaration of policy on constitutional reform in this country. Our friends, the British, at that time—even to-day I don't think they have given up this game—did not want that these two organizations should meet in the same city, leave alone under one roof. You know, ladies and gentlemen, that that session of the All-India Muslim League at its first meeting was broken up under the very nose of the police. We asked the Government to hold an enquiry, as we felt that it was with the connivance of the police, and with the support of the bureaucracy, that the meeting of the Muslim League had been broken up.

I do not want to go into details. It is a matter of history. I want just to skip over those events and give you the background. At the end of the next year, that is in December 1916, the Congress and the League again met at Lucknow, and there we signed, sealed and delivered the Lucknow Pact, known as the Hindu-Muslim Lucknow Pact. But that Pact

was mutilated by the British Parliament in various ways. After that came the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms declaration.

Enter Mr. Gandhi

It was in 1916-17, while this was going on, that Mr. Gandhi came on the horizon. Let us see what happened. Mr. Gandhi puts his declaration in *Young India* on May 12, 1920—You will remember that in this same auspicious month of May Mr. B.C. Pall made his declaration seven years ago—and what does Mr. Gandhi say?

> "It will be seen that for me there are not politics but religion. They subserve religion." (You will see later what Mr. Gandhi has done in pursuance of his declaration. He says further . . .)
>
> "The politician in me has never dominated a single decision of mine, and if I take part in politics, it is only because politics encircle us to-day like the coils of a snake, from which one cannot get out, no matter how much one tries. In order to wrestle with this snake, I have been experimenting with myself and my friends in politics by introducing religion into politics."

Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, he has done that with a vengeance, as you will perceive when I go further. In 1921, after he captured the Congress at Nagpur, he said in *Young India* on October 21, 1921 :

> "I call myself a Sanatani (orthodox) Hindu because, firstly, I believe in the Vedas, the Upanishadas, the Puranas and all that goes by the name of Hindu scriptures and therefore in *Avatars* and rebirth." (Ultimately he himself became an *Avatar*!)
>
> "Secondly, I believe in the Varnashrama Dharma (the law of the Caste system) in its Vedic form.
>
> "Thirdly, I believe in the protection of the cow as an

article of faith, and, fourthly, I do not disbelieve in idol worship."

He says in a milder form, "I do not *disbelieve* in idol worship."

In spite of these declarations, which are so clear and unequivocal, the Hindu Nationalists got a little nervous about it. They did not know that here is a man, a far-sighted, shrewd man. So there was a little apprehension and nervousness; and in order to reassure them, this is what he said in 1924:

"It has been whispered that by being so much with Musalman friends, I make myself unfit to know the Hindu mind. The Hindu mind is myself. Surely, I do not live amidst Hindus to know the Hindu mind when every fibre of my being is Hindu.

"My Hindusim must be a very poor thing if it cannot flourish under influences the most adverse."

Yet ladies and gentlemen, you will remember that when I expressed my desire to meet him as a Hindu leader, he resented it—and yet he says, "every fibre of his being is Hindu", which means that his Hindu mind is impregnable. This was in 1924.

1925 *and After*

From 1925 onwards, as you know, many efforts were made for the adjustment of Hindu-Muslim differences. Every time we were the petitioners, the supplicants standing at the doors of Mr. Gandhi and the Congress, with our proposals formulated. For some reason or other the reply was "No". They never made any counter-proposals. You remember, in 1927 at Delhi we formulated some proposals. Somehow or other, fortunately or unfortunately, those proposals were substantially accepted by the Congress at Madras at the end of 1927. Therefore, the communal settlement was brought about and two committees were appointed, by the Muslim League and the Congress, jointly to make a political demand. Let me tell

you that when these two committees met, it was Mr. Gandhi who smashed it up, and the Nehru Report was started, contrary to the resolutions of these two organizations, after the two committees had actually met but dissolved. So we were forced to withdraw our proposals. What happened next? Then came the Nehru Report. You know the history of it. I shall only tell you what Maulana Mohammad Ali said about the Nehru Report. He was an independent man. Some of the Muslims in the Congress had suffered more than anybody else. This is what Maulana Mohammad Ali says :

> "In the days of the rule of the British India Company, the Government street-criers used to announce the dual sovereignty of India before notifying any Government notice, proclaiming the formula, namely, *Khalq Khuda Ki, Mulk Maleka Ka, Hukum Company Bahadur Ka* (the people belong to God, the country belongs to the Queen and the Government belongs to the Company Bahadur). But under the proposed regime of the Nehru Scheme of Mr. Gandhi, the Government street-criers will announce the new dual sovereignty of India by declaring the formula, namely, Khalq Khuda Ki, Mulk British Ka, Hukum Mahasabha Bahadur Ka—(The people belong to God, the country belongs to the British and the Government belongs to the Hindu Mahasabha Bahadur.)"

Presiding over a public meeting in Bombay in 1930, Maulana Mohammad Ali, who had worked, suffered and made sacrifices along with the Congressmen, says :

> "Mr. Gandhi is working under the influence of the communalist Hindu Mahasabha. He is fighting for the supremacy of Hinduism and the submersion of Muslims. He has never consulted the Muslim community on the question of starting the Civil Disobedience movement. He wants to triumphantly pass over the head of the Indian Muslim community. We have not broken any pledge, pact or treaty We are not traitors to India. The Musalmans have been oppressed and persecuted by the excesses of the

Hindu majority in the last 10 years, but Mr. Gandhi never tried to improve matters or condemn Hindu terrorism against the Muslims. He never denounced the movements of *Shuddhi* and *Sanghatan* which openly and clearly aimed at the annihilation of Muslims and Islam in India. He repudiated and broke the Madras Hindu-Muslim agreement. Now we have no option but to follow the Quranic teaching, namely, "If you fear treachery and pledge-breaking from any community, then throw the treaty on her face. Allah does not approve the action of traitors and pledge breakers."

Now we come to the Second Round Table Conference to which Mr. Gandhi went for the first time as the sole representative of the Congress. What happened there? All attempts for a settlement were again smashed up by him very clearly and with some excuse or other. You will find in Dr. Ambedkar's book that one of the conditions that he imposed upon the Muslim delegation in London was that he would be prepared to agree to our proposals on the express condition that we, the Muslims, should oppose the scheduled castes asking for any kind of separate electorates or special treatment. In other words, Mr. Gandhi did not want special treatment to be given to the scheduled castes. Now, I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, how is it possible that any man who has got any elementary idea of honour, of integrity, of fairplay, of justice, to agree to this, that these 70 millions, who are the biggest blot on the fair name of India, should be kept as untouchables, at the mercy of the Sanathanists, Mr. Gandhi being one. I assure you in the name of humanity I care more for them than for Musalmans. After all, we, Musalmans, are capable of giving and taking. Could there be any condition so offensive and absurd as this one laid down by Mr. Gandhi. The second condition was that you Muslims agree that you will fight for the freedom of the country. Am I so degraded as to accept such a condition? I want the freedom of the people of this country more than anybody else. It looked as if Mr. Gandhi had a monopoly for the love and the freedom of the country. The thing naturally broke down. When

the Minorities Committee of the Round-Table Conference met, this is what Mr. Gandhi said—and the real thing that was at the back of his mind always came out at the critical moment, in a roundabout way. He was addressing the minority community and Mr. MacDonald was presiding. He said :

> "Further you will allow me to say that this was hardly the time to summon the Minorities Committee. The solution of the communal tangle can be the crown of the Swaraj Constitution and not its foundation. Our differences have hardened, if they have not arisen, by reason of the foreign domination. I have not a shadow of doubt that the iceberg of communal differences will melt under the warmth of the sun of freedom."

What did Mr. MacDonald say? Even the Prime Minister was provoked to such an extent that he spoke out. Whatever may be said about Mr. MacDonald, he had really a very soft corner for the aspirations of India. This is what he said to Mr. Gandhi :

> "Be honest and face the facts. The communal problem is a problem of fact. Does the problem exist in India or does it not exist? I do not answer. I leave it to you honestly to answer it for yourselves and to yourselves.
>
> "Then if the communal problem does exist, how can it be discussed with a view to settlement, either in India or here? At the foundation of any progress towards the setting up of an Indian constitution lies the problem of community representation, community rights, community protection and so on . . ."

Gandhi's Institutions

That closed the chapter of the Round-Table Conference. What happened then? I will tell you very briefly. Mr. Gandhi put up the following institutions :

1. *The Gandhi Ashram* (Monastery) at Sevagram, Wardha. (To serve as the Vatican of Gandhism and the Capital of the Congress.)

2. *The Gandhi Seva Sangha* (A small body of nine Gandhian Cardinals, or High Patriarchs, who form the permanent Inner Cabinet of Gandhi and Gandhism.)

3. *Gandhi Harijan Seva Sangha* (To consolidate the Depressed Classes as integral parts of Hindustan and to prevent their conversion to Islam or Christianity.)

4. *Gandhi Hindi Prachar Sangha* (To propagate Sanskritized Hindi as the State national language of India and to displace Urdu from its place of primacy and popularity.)

5. *Gandhi Nagri Prachar Sabha* (To propagate the idea that all Indian languages should be written in Hindi Devanagari Script and to displace Urdu Script.)

6. *Gandhi Gram Sudhar Sabha* (Village Welfare League, to preach and propagate Gandhian principles in the Villages)

7. Gandhi Khadi Prathisthan (To preach the cult of the spinning wheel and Khadi or hand woven cloth, which is worshipped as a fetish.)

8. *Gandhi Wardha Talimi Sangha* was also later organized to propagate Gandhian principles of religion, spiritualism, national economy and nationalism through a State-controlled system of compulsory primary education. Under the Wardha scheme, the entire system of education of the country was sought to be made subservient to the propagation of Gandhism (which was only a new form of Hinduism to the exclusion of all other religions).

9. *Gandhi Gow Rakhsha Sabha* (Cow Cult Association).

Gandhi is a great believer in the Hindu Cow Cult—the worship of the cow as a goddess. He has therefore made *Gow Rakhsha Sabha* and Cow Exhibition an adjunct of the Congress.

10. *Gandhi Seva Sangha* is the Mother-Superior of all these associations. Mr. Gandhi, while addressing the Gandhi Seva Sangha, says :

> "Spheres of action of these associations are limited. But yours is unlimited. Yours is a mighty tree of which these various associations may be called branches."

This is how he addressed his Mother-Superior. Not only that, but you will find that he appointed certain Deputies. Besides dividing the whole subcontinent of India into three definite Parliamentary Zones and appointing three Parliamentary Zone-Dictators like their Nazi counterparts of District Fuehrers, has also gradually developed permanent Deputy Mahatmas in almost all provinces and zones. These Deputy Mahatmas are the confirmed Cardinals of Gandhism, believers in the Gandhian Principles and Gandhian Dictatorship—carriers of his message and executors of his orders. For instance, the permanent Secretary of the All-India Congress Office is Acharya Kripalani, a great exponent and theorist of Gandhism and author of the famous article *The Gandhian Way*; Kaka Kalekar is in charge of the Gandhian programme of Hindi and Nagri. Mr. Mashruwala is in charge of the Grand Council of Cardinals of Gandhism the Gandhi Seva Sangha. Mr. Arya Nayakam and Mr. Kumarappa are in charge of the Wardha Education Schemes. Dr. Prafulla Chandra Ghosh, the Deputy Gandhi of Bengal, is in charge of Khadi Pratisthan and Gandhi Ashram in Bengal. Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the Deputy Gandhi of Bihar, is in charge of the Sadaqat Ashrams in Bihar. The Frontier Gandhi, Abdul Ghaffar, is in charge of the Hinduization influence and emasculation of the martial Pathans—the bugbear of the dreamers of Hindu Raj. He is in charge of the Gandhi Ashram in N.W.F.P. Sardar Patel is the Deputy Gandhi in Gujrat and Bombay. Shankar Rao Deo is the Deputy Gandhi of Maharashtra. Dr. Pattabhi Sitarammayya another theorist and exponent of Gandhism, is the Deputy Gandhi of the Andhra Province—and so on and so forth.

Gandhi, Hitler and Mussolini

It is not my testimony. I am going to give you the testimony of the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the All-India National Congress that took place at Tripuri. At that time the organization had develcped to a very great extent. I want the people to understand the facts, and then come to their own conclusions. This is what Seth Govind Das, the Chairman of the Reception Committee, said :

> "Our Congress organization can be compared with the Fascist Party of Italy, the Nazi Party of Germany and the Communist Party of Russia, although they have embraced violence and we are wedded to the creed of non-violence. All the inhabitants of Italy are not Fascists, the entire German public is not Nazi, neither are all Russians Communists but they all have faith in their respective parties. Every Indian is not a four-anna member of the Congress, yet all Indians are with the Congress. Mahatma Gandhi occupies the same position among Congressmen as that held by Mussolini among Fascists, Hitler among Nazis and Stalin among Communists. The Congress, as at present constituted, is the creation of Mahatma Gandhi."

Now we are repeatedly told by this organization in India that the Muslim League is a communal organization. It is the Hindu leaders who have deliberately, and with a set purpose, destroyed any possible chance of adjustment between these two communities by well-planned and systematic manoeuvres, and by organizing themselves. And then they call it Nationalism .... Nationalism — Democracy .... Democracy !

I ask you, is this nationalism, is this democracy ? When we say 'No', we have this experience for the last 24 years and its unimpeachable evidence. But we have heard and felt hurt who in vain they say that we have destroyed it, and the talk of Nationalism and Democracy. Either they can't understand or they are dishonest. Don't they understand it when we say that the Parliamentary system

of democracy is not suited to the genius of this country? Surely it is obvious. It is not a question of Democracy as a foundation of popular, representative, constitutional government.

Appeal to Give Up Pose

We have made it clear that there cannot be any room for democracy when you have a nation working on these lines. Not only have we evidence; but we have suffered and experienced that. When you talk of democracy, you mean Hindu Raj, to dominate over the Muslims, a totally different nation, different in culture, different in everything. You yourself are working for Hindu Nationalism and Hindu Raj.

Ladies and gentlemen, we learned democracy 1,300 years ago. It is in our blood, and it is as far away from the Hindu society as are the Arctic regions. You tell us that we are not democratic. It is we who have learned the lesson of equality and brotherhood of man. Among you, one taste will not take a cup of water from another. Is this democracy ? Is this honesty ? We are for democracy. But not the democracy of your conception, which will turn the whole of India into a Gandhi Ashram. One society and nation will, by its permanent majority, destroy another nation or society in permanent minority —all that is dear to the minority.

I give you these facts. I say, give up, give up this pose. You have made your bed. You may lie on it. Have your Hindu nationalism : have your democracy to your heart's content. Have your Hindustan if you can. I wish you Godspeed. But I am not going, as long as there is life left in a single Musalman, to have this Hindu Raj. The Irish Nationalist Leader Redmond met Carson, the Ulster leader, and told him, "Look here, can't we come to some settlement. Why do you want to separate from Ireland." Mind you, there is not one millionth part of the differences between the peoples of Ulster and Ireland. What was Carson's reply ? "I do not want to be ruled by you." My reply to Mr. Gandhi is, "I do not want to be ruled by you."

That is the position. I only appeal. If only my humble voice could reach Hindu India—I appeal to them, "Give up this pose." You want freedom for the people of this land. I say not only for myself, but for all Musalmans, give up what seems a boyhood's dream of some of the Hindu leaders and what has been their manhood's aim. You have failed. Thank God, you have failed. Let us close that chapter. Even nations who have killed millions of each other—which we have not yet done—who may be the bitterest enemies to-day, may become friends to-morrow. That is politics. If your leaders are on this path, as I say they are, and if you do not approve of it, it is your responsibility, the responsibility of the Hindu public, to come forward and say, "Stop this internecine war, declare a truce; let us sit as equals and come to a settlement." That is now the problem. I ask you—I may be wrong—how can you keep on saying that it is the British Government who has kept us apart ? How can you go on singing this same song—I am not holding any brief for the British Government I shall have to say something about them when I come to it.

I am trying to reason with my own people in this land. It serves no useful purpose to say that the British do not want an agreement between us. Of course, I grant that the British take advantage of our folly. But we have devices of our own, which are better than any which the British can fashion to keep us disunited. When we have had this notice a million times that it was the policy of the British in India to divide and rule, why can't we unite and get the British out; why can't we do it in spite of them ? Therefore, I say, it is no use appealing to other nations of the world.

The different nations of the world can only show us sympathy in our demand to be free and self-governing. They will of course do whatever they can. But what is the use of appealing to other nations to settle our affairs ? How can anybody do it ? Are they going to run the Government here ? Are they going to send representatives from America to your Parliament and see that your Parliament is carried on pro-

perly ? Will any other country send members to your Legislature and see that the Legislature functions properly ? If they do, then we are exactly where we are. It will be your Representatives, it will be your Cabinet that will be functioning. Therefore. I say, that our destiny is in our own hands. Specially when obstacles are put in our way, it is all the more reason why we should come to an agreement in spite of them.

Nehru's Double Role

Now we come to recent events. I do not want to add anything more than our resolution with regard to the proposal that Sir Stafford Cripps' brought to India on behalf of His Majesty's Government. Although the final decision of the League was taken after the Allahabad Session, you know the reasons and grounds, and I do not want to take up your time and repeat them. Sir Cripps proposals were not acceptable, of course, to us and to the Congress for different reasons. So far as the Congress is concerned, even from his last speech that Mr. Gandhi made, it is clear that he was not only opposed to the Pakistan Scheme, but considered that it was a sin. He cannot use a stronger word—if you know Mr. Gandhi. Mind you, it is not a crime, it is a sin—that is, you will be doomed in this world as well as in the next if you talk of Pakistan. While it was given out that the Cripps' proposals were not acceptable to the Congress—I know nothing of what actually happened between Cripps and the Congress—so far as the public are concerned, it was said that the proposals were rejected on the ground, first of the Veto and then of the Defence portfolio. Well, about the same time when this controversy was going on between Mr. Cripps and the Congress, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, in an article sent by wireless to America and published in *The New York Times* of July 19, 1942, says:

"Thirty years ago the British Government introduced the principle of separate religious electorates in India, a fatal thing which has come in the way of development of

political parties. Now they have tried to introduce the idea of partitioning India not only into two but possibly many separate parts. This was one of the reasons which led to bitter resentment of the Cripps proposals. The All-India Congress could not agree to this."

Was it on the question of veto or was it on the ground of the defence portfolio ? Or was it that the All-India Congress was not agreed to any idea of Pakistan. To this country is given one version and to America another ! Americans are propagandists themselves. But I think they must realize and fully realize that they are no better propagandists than the Indian National Congress.

Civil Disobedience

Well, after that you come to Individual Civil Disobedience —not for any political purpose, but for the freedom of speech. Now what liberty of speech do you want ?—liberty of speech to preach and to advocate, in every possible way, the prevention of war efforts ? I think even if it was our own Government, if I had any say in the matter, and if an organization, the most powerful organization in the country, with all its resources, wanted to be let loose to preach against the war effort, I would not tolerate it. I would put them in jail. But if it were a conscientious objector, I could understand.

How can you expect any Government, much less a foreign Government, to allow this to be carried on ? Let us take a commonsense view of it. Was it really intended to vindicate freedom of speech, or was it intended to prevent the war effort to embarrass and coerce the British Government to concede their demand ? In the meantime, Mr. Gandhi was saying that he would never launch his Civil Disobedience movement because it would be suicidal. But mind you, Mr. Gandhi said he was never going to launch C.D. movement because it would be against the wishes of the Muslim League. He was saying for the last 22 years that he lived for Hindu-Muslim unity, that it was the sole aim of his life, and without Hindu-Muslim unity they could never achieve freedom. In July last year,

when he struck upon a new technique, an entirely new technique, it was not then suicidal to ignore the Muslim League and whether the Muslim League came in or not. He revised his declarations of 22 years that there could be no *swaraj*, no freedom without Hindu-Muslim unity. It is all thrown to the winds, suddenly, when Mr. Gandhi lays down the policy and programme in the famous resolution of August 8. What is it ? "Quit India." Look at the enormity ! Don't care, don't care what these 100 million people of this country have to say ! I am going to bend this Government to surrender to my desire ? The British said—and mind you I, don't take everything they say to be correct—they said : "In resisting the Congress we are really protecting you and safeguarding your interests, because if we were to surrender to the demands of the Congress, it would be at your risk and sacrifice." But the Musalmans say : "We don't believe that you love us so much." We know it suits them and they are taking the fullest advantage of the situation, because if there is any agreement between Hindus and Muslims, then they know the net result of that would be parting with power. They say they are only too anxious to part with power, but we do not agree in uniting. If we cannot secure power as a united India, then let us take it as divided India.

The Cockpit of a Feud

Now let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen—and here I tell you if my humble voice reaches the Hindu public, to consider carefully whether I am right or wrong—I shall, put it as frankly as possible. The British policy in this subcontinent has for nearly 100 years been based on their conviction that the Muslims and Hindus will never agree, and that if by some means or other they enter into an agreement, by their influence or pressure, then it will be nothing but the cockpit of a feud beneath the umbrella of a united India—with the Englishman on the top. Therefore the Britisher, with his farsighted vision, has followed a policy and taken us on this line of a united democratic India—I don't think they have given it up yet—the line of a united India and a democratic supremacy

system of government. The Britishers know that if we are kept on that line it will prolong their lease of supremacy, that if we were to frame a Constitution as a democratically united India, we would never come to an agreement without their arbitration. When you have quarrelled and broken each others heads, then the monkey will come in to do justice between two cats. That is the reason why—there being a strong diehard British school of thought—our friends who happen to be at the head of the Government of India to-day (the great man, Lord Linlithgow, the Viceroy, and Mr. Amery, Secretary of State for India, who are a pucca diehard brand) are still dangling the carrot before the donkey by saying that geographically India is one. The other great man in London has suddenly discovered that historically India was united under Akbar.

My friends, I have no ill-will against the Hindus. I want you to know that if by any miracle you can come to a constitutionally united democratic India, you can only do so, as far as British India is concerned.

Indian States

Let me tell you that the Britishers know that we will have to get over another hurdle—the biggest hurdle—namely, the Indian States. You will find so many hurdles—1, 2, 3 and 4. You are asked to get over these hurdles, and the last hurdle is the most difficult one to get over. You may think as much as you like. The policy that the British Government have pursued for nearly 100 years leads to this. Not only have they somehow or other made you miss the bus; but have they put you in the wrong bus. Now, do not allow yourselves to be bamboozled and fooled any longer. It is nearly a century. I say to the Hindus—and the Britishers know it better than anybody else—that the quickest way for the freedom of the peoples, both Hindus and Muslims, is Pakistan. It may come in my life time or not—you will remember these words of mine, and I say this with no ill-will or offence : Some nations have killed millions of each other, and yet an enemy

of to-day is a friend of to-morrow. That is life. That is history.

So I say this with a clear conscience. My profound regret is that it is the Congress and its Hindu leadership that are holding up the achievement of the freedom of both the Hindus and the Musalmans. I appeal to the Hindu public and Hindu leaders : Review, revise your policy. A lot of propaganda, false propaganda, is being carried on by the Congress, and recently the appeals and statements they have published are fundamentally wrong.

The Congress position has been this from the start up to August 8, that the policy and demand for Pakistan is an untruth. In his correspondence with the Viceroy, Mr. Gandhi had forgotten to mention this point altogether, and hence he puts this in a postscript. "The Government have evidently ignored or overlooked the very material fact that the Congress, by its August resolution, asked nothing for itself. All its demands were for the whole people. As you should be aware, the Congress was willing and prepared for the Government inviting Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah to form a National Government subject to such agreed adjustments as may be necessary for the duration of the war, such Government being responsible to a duly elected assembly."

Am I Wrong?

This is Mr. Gandhi's language. The whole crux of this proposal is that he wants such a government as will be 'responsible to a duly elected assembly'. I ask you : what is left if this is carried out? Is there any doubt that Lord Linlithgow will be immediately turned into a constitutional Co-Governor-General—or he might get a kick. The India Office will be abolished; the office of the Secretary of State will be abolished, and the British Parliament will have no say in India. This Central Constitution can only be brought into effect by repealing the present Constitution completely, and substituting another. If I am wrong, I shall stand corrected. Once the present central foundation structure is gone, the surrounding

I am told that we should do something. As far as my information goes, there is no change. What are we to do? When I was invited to the so-called 'No-Party Conference,' I said to Mr. C. Rajagopalachari that I did not want to attend the Conference, and I gave my reasons for it. I do not want to attack them in any way. I do not want to create any unnecessary bitterness. We know, of course, that they have no following, but they are men who occupy some position in life, men who have some experience. May be they are our political opponents; but once they were in the forefront, in the vanguard of the political movement. In the country these gentlemen could have adopted a more effective method of tackling this question than the resolution they passed and the procedure they adopted. But great men also make mistakes. Mr. Gandhi gets all the information, all the newspapers and knows and understands what is going on. If there is any change of heart on his part, he has only to drop me a few lines, when, I assure you, the Muslim League will not fail, whatever may have been our controversies in the past.

The Hardest Nut to Crack

Now I come to the Britishers. They are the hardest nut to crack. What is their position? Their position is this. The Congress is a rebel organization. It is guilty of high treason. They are the enemies of the Government and the Crown. Therefore no truck with them They are only one party. But the overwhelming majority of the people of India are not with the Congress; they are with the British Government. What do the recent statements of the Premier say? What does the press in London say? The Sunday Chronicle in a leader says: "Prime Minister Churchill's message, praising the gallantry of the Indian soldiers. will find an echo in the heart of the British nation." Where is the echo? Mr. Churchill went into mathematical figures, and he made out that the overwhelming majority of the people of India were not with the Congress. So far as the Muslim League is concerned, there is not the slightest doubt, we have kept aloof and thank

like this. Therefore reconsider your position. What is our demand ? Make a declaration. The Muslim League calls upon the British Government to come forward, without any further delay, with an unequivocal declaration guaranteeing to the Musalmans the right of self-determination, and to pledge themselves that they will abide by the verdict of a plebiscite on the lines of the resolution passed at the Muslim League Session in Lahore in 1940

Attitude to the War

The Muslim League has been ready, and is still ready and willing, to consider any proposals and negotiate with any party on a footing of equality for the setting up of a provisional Government at the Centre, in order to mobilize the resources of the country for the purpose of the defence of India and the successful prosecution of the war. This resolution was passed at Bombay on August 20, 1942. That has so far been completely ignored. Now we are, in this war, kept in the position of mere spectators. I have said it once, and I say it again on this occasion, that whatever may be our views and opinions, there is not the slightest doubt that—a fact is a fact—India is in the war. Being in the war, whose interest is greater now? Is it more in the interest of the Britisher, or is it in the interest of the United Nations, who are in it like America, or is it more in our interests that we should not be reduced to mere helpless spectators by one device or the other, by one manoeuvre or the other, by one excuse or the other, to keep the 100 millions as they are and to carry on without their co-operation? They are making a great mistake. They are not out of the woods yet. Let me tell you as I have said very often : Our American friends can go to New York or Chicago if they are beaten, and the British can go to London. And further, I can say that their country is not going to be ruled by Hitler or Mussolini or the Mikado. That to my mind is inconceivable. It may happen that America is reduced to a second-rate power after the war. That is the danger. But their danger does not go to length that their country might be ruled by another foreign power. What is my position? It is this, if this war is

lost, there is no other Power : either Japan or Hitler will come to this country, and we shall come under the jackboot of Hitler or Tojo. I have no Chicago or London to go to.

What about us? Who is more interested in defending this country and prosecuting this war? It is not a sentimental thing. I say, nobody more than we. It is we who will suffer the ravages of war and the destruction and devastation of our homes and hearths in Muslim Zones in the East and West, which are the immediate targets of the enemy. Who is more likely to lose, who is more likely to suffer than we? Who is more interested in defending India? It is thoroughly dishonest for the British to say that we are non-cooperating . . . The Muslim League says. "We cannot co-operate because you want us to come in as mere camp-followers. What are the prospects for us? What will be the fruits of victory for us, when we have given our money, our blood and everything? If we are defeated, Japan or Germany will come. If we win, we are just camp-followers and may get a *baksheesh* in the end. Is this an incentive to co-operation? Can any honourable, self-respecting or organized nation accept that position? That is the picture. Therefore, either they have blundered and are blundering, or they do not really want to part with power. They are taking their chance as a gambler does, saying to themselves : "If we win, we will keep them where they are. If we lose, then after us the delgue?" *Apres nous le deluge*.

I do not want to say anything more about Pakistan. There is no difficulty in understanding Pakistan. Even outsiders have understood it. Again, it reminded me of Gokhale when Major Yeats Brown in his new book says : "Let us put ourselves in Muslim slippers." Here is the passage from his book :

"Let us put ourselves in Muslim slippers. We, British, would consider ourselves aggrieved if some world improving superman or super-government were to decree that we should be ruled by an All-Europe Government (no doubt with safeguards), with Teutons as the dominant race—or

Slavs, if you prefer—because we were a minority in Europe."

Then he says further: "Even if this Super-Government consisted of supermen of infinite strength and wisdom, we should submit to it only just so long as we had not the strength to throw off the shackle. And if the supermen showed signs of doubting their own decision, yet continued to asseverate before the world that they had offered freedom to all Europe, that it was now incumbent on us to find a solution to the difficulty we should reply as the Muslim League has, that such freedom was a farce."

May I add here that Mr. Gandhi, the superman, precisely wants *Akhand* Hindustan; and Muslim India cannot and will not agree to this demand. What would the Englishman say? Will he then say, "Smaller nations cannot exist. We are in a small island—only 35 million people. They are Teuton brothers, the Germans, and 80 millions." If a proposal were made that they should have one Government, would the English agree? What is the difference between an Englishman and a German? To begin with, they are the Anglo-Saxon race and all Christians. Their dress is not different. Their calendar is not different. Their language and jurisprudence and culture are not very different. Their architecture, art, music and civilization are not different. But what would an Englishman say? What would Canada say, if to-morrow a proposal were made that Canada and the United States should become one federated government, and Canada become one of the units? And what about others—North America and South America? America is geographically one, So is Europe. So is Asia. What would they say if such a proposition were made. Therefore Major Yeats Brown says, very rightly, "Put yourselves into Muslim slippers". Even if the government consisted of supermen of infinite strength and wisdom, we should not submit to it while we did not have the strength to throw off the shackles. The Muslim League would consider such a freedom a faice.

Hindu Conception of Freedom

This is what should be considered by the Hindu leaders. The freedom they are offering to us is the freedom of their conception, the freedom of their determination, the freedom of their rule—which is a farce. Well, therefore, there is no difficulty of understanding. First of all, we have got to settle the basis. Do you really want to create some confusion and get some material for the purpose of propaganda ? I have no doubt in my mind that a large body of us visualize Pakistan as a people's government. Either you seize it by force or get it by agreement. But until you get it—whether it is from a foreign nation or whether it is from our own government—the question as to the constitution and the form and system of government does not arise. Let us take the revolution of France. The party that wanted to break the Government had to have a Constituent Assembly after they seized the country. Take the case of Australia—that happened by agreement. Let us first agree that there shall be two Indias. Then the constitution-making body will be elected by some system from the people, and it is the people who will choose their representatives to go to the constitution-making body. Therefore, I visualize a constitution making body being set up and based on a very low franchise. It may be two annas, or it may be an adult franchise in Pakistan. You will elect your representatives to the constitution-making body. You may not know your power, you may not know how to use it. This would be your fault. But I am sure that democracy is in our blood. It is in our marrows. Only centuries of adverse circumstances have made the circulation of that blood cold. It has got frozen, and your arteries are not functioning. But thank God, the blood is circulating again, thanks to the Muslim League efforts. It will be a People's Government.

Here I should like to give a warning to the landlords and capitalists who have flourished at our expense by a system which is so vicious, which is so wicked and which makes them so selfish, that it is difficult to reason with them. The exploitation of the masses has gone into their blood. They have

forgotten the lesson of Islam. Greed and selfishness have made these people subordinate the interests of others in order to fatten themselves. It is true we are not in power to-day. You go anywhere to the countryside. I visited some villages. There are millions and millions of our people who hardly get one meal a day. Is this civilization ? Is this the aim of Pakistan ? Do you visualize that millions have been exploited and cannot get one meal a day ? If that is the idea of Pakistan, I would not have it. If they are wise they will have to adjust themselves to the new modern conditions of life. If they don't, God help them: we shall not help them. Therefore let us have faith in ourselves. Let us not falter or hesitate—that is our goal. We are going to achieve it. The Constitution of Pakistan can only be framed by the millat and the people. Prepare yourselves and see that you frame a Constitution which is to your heart's desire. There is a lot of misunderstanding. A lot of mischief is created. Is it going to be an Islamic Government ? It is not begging the question ? Is it not a question of passing a vote of censure on yourself ? The Constitution and the Government will be what the people will decide. The only question is that of minorities.

The Minorities

The minorities are entitled to get a definite assurance or to ask, 'Where do we stand in the Pakistan that you visualize ?' That is an issue of giving a definite and clear assurance to the minorities. We have done it. We have passed a resolution that the minorities must be protected and safeguarded to the fullest extent; and as I said before, any civilized Government will do it and ought to do it. So far as we are concerned, our own history and our prophet have given the clearest proof that the non-Muslims have been treated not only justly and fairly but generously.

Now one more thing I wish to say about Pakistan is this. There is a new propaganda. We had many wicked propagandas, like the one of cutting the mother cow into two, vivisection of

mother India and all the rest. The latest argument, which I think is really very wicked—of all, the most wicked. The argument is this : that Mr. Jinnah is working for the territories in the North-West and Eastern zones as 'Pak' and the others as 'No-Pak'. I have heard this from several quarters—and I was thunderstruck. You know what false propaganda can do I think you will bear me out that when we passed the Lahore Resolution, we had not used the word 'Pakistan.' Who gave us this word ? Let me tell you it is their fault. They started damning the resolution on the ground that it was Pakistan. They are really ignorant of the Muslim movement. They fathered this word upon us. Give the dog a bad name and then hang him. They shouted Pan-Islamism. When this was exploded, then came 'Pakistan' means alliance with other Muslim countries—Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and Turkey —and they will grind down Hindu India. That is the deep game they are playing. You know perfectly well that Pakistan is a word which is really foisted upon us and fathered on us by some section of the Hindu press and also by the British Press. Now our resolution was known for a long time as the Lahore Resolution, popularly known as Pakistan. But how long are we to have this long phrase. I now say to my Hindu and British friends : we thank you for giving us one word.

What is the origin of the word Pakistan? It was not the Muslim League or the Quaid i-Azam who coined it. Some young fellows in London, who wanted a particular part of the North-West to be separated from the rest of India and coined a name in 1929-30, started the idea and called a zone Pakistan. They picked up the letter 'P' for Punjab, 'A' for Afghan (as the N. W. F. P. is known even to-day as Afghan), 'K' for Kashmir, 'S' for Sind, and 'Tan' for Baluchistan. A name was coined. Thus whatever may have been the meaning of this word at the time—it is obvious that the language of every civilized country invents new words—the word 'Pakistan' has come to mean the Lahore Resolution. We wanted a word and it was foisted on us, and we found it convenient to use it as a synonym for the Lahore Resolution

Loose Federation

We are asked by some constitutional Pandits, "Why can there not be some sort of loose federation or confederation?" People talk like that. I shall read out to you what I have written on this point, because it is important :

"There are people who talk of some sort of a loose federation. There are people who talk of giving the widest freedom to the federating units and residuary powers resting with the units. But they forget the entire constitutional history of the various parts of the world. Federation, however described and in whatever terms it is put, must ultimately deprive the federating units of authority in all vital matters. The units, despite themselves, would be compelled to grant more and more powers to the central authority, until in the end the strong central government will have been established by the units themselves—they will be driven to do so by absolute necessity, if the basis of a federal government is accepted Taking for instance the United States and her history, the Dominion of Canada and Australia, the Union of South Africa and Germany, and of other lands where federal or confederal systems have been in existence, necessity has driven the component members and obliged them to increase and delegate their power and authority to the connecting link, namely, the Central Government."

These ideas are based entirely on a wrong footing, due to a want of correct understanding as to what federation really means or implies. It is not of much importance whether the units in theory have the residuary powers or the centre. But once the units accept the basis of a federal central government, it follows that it will inevitably and out of sheer necessity resolve itself into an all powerful central auhority; and the units will be compelled to grant and delegate more and more powers to the centre, which also can hold these units as connecting links—more or less like county councils or glorified municipalities or feudatory States under the central authority.

We are opposed to any scheme—nor can we agree to any proposal which has for its basis any conception or idea of a Central government—federal or confederal; for it is bound to lead in the long run to the emasculation of the entire Muslim nation—socially, educationally, culturally, economically and politically—and to the establishment of Hindu majority raj in this subcontinent.

Therefore, remove from your mind any idea of some form of such a loose federation. There is no such thing as loose federation. When there is a central government and provincial governments, they will go on tightening, tightening, and tightening until you are pulverized with regard to your powers as units.

South Africa

Well gentlemen, I think I have exhausted most of the points. There can be no doubt that the recent communal India Legislation in South Africa is the blackest of the black. That it should have been undertaken at this critical moment when, on the one hand, every unit of the Empire is asked to contribute to the war effort—and Indians were considered good enough to shed their blood and to stand side by side with white men, or even to pick them up when they had fallen on the battlefield to save their lives—but on the other hand, this badge of the horrible colour-bar is the reward for one of the members of the Commonwealth who is contributing his share in blood, which is acknowledged and praised duly.

I am astonished that the Secretary of State for India, when he was asked in Parliament, should say that he has no statement to make, while the whole of India was condemning this bill—including even the Government of India, which is an agent of the British Government. Can we not learn a lesson from this with regard to our internal political controversies?

The Indian States

There is one other point. Recently another unfortunate

thing has come to my notice. Things are not at all well in the Indian States. I shall name only some of the States : Kashmir, Gwallior and Kotah. It seems to me that it is most unfortunate; and I appeal to those States where the Hindus are in the majority and where there is real Hindu power to set a better example. Similarly, I advise those Muslim rulers where the Musalmans are in the majority that they should treat the minority community fairly and deal with their legitimate grievances suitably. It is not the way we will deal with the problem of India—that wherever you happen to be in the majority you should wreak your vengeance or bitterness over the minority. You would be nearer the solution of the problem if you protect the minority. I hope that some satisfactory solution will be arrived at. I shall be equally grieved if the Muslim power or Muslim majorities ill treat the Hindu minorities.

Conclusion

There remains finally one thing. I say to the Musalmans, we have gone through nearly seven years of various vicissitudes, and we have reached the stage where there is not the slightest doubt that the 100 million Musalmans are with us. When I say 100 million Musalmans, I mean that 99 per cent of them are with us, leaving aside some who are traitors, cranks, supermen or lunatics—an evil from which no society or nation is free. The way in which I see them now is that the phoenix-like rise and regeneration of Muslim India from the very ashes of its ruination, after the terrible destructions in India in the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries is a miracle. The people who had lost everything and who were placed by providence between the two stones of a mill, not only came into their own in a very short time, but became, after the British, socially the most solid, militarily the most virile, and politically the most decisive factor in modern India.

Now it is time to take up the constructive programme to build up this nation so that it can march on the path of our goal of Pakistan. It is for you all to put your heads together,

your Council of the All-India Muslim League, and undertake proper and systematic planning—I can only repeat once again, for educational uplift, social uplift, economic uplift, political uplift and cultural uplift of the nation. We as a nation have got to attempt this constructive programme. I hope you will be able to do it. In the meantime, I will conclude by saying : The goal is near, stand united, persevere and march forward.

17

DIVIDE AND QUIT*

Brother delegates of the All-India Muslim League, ladies and gentlemen : I thank you for having once more honoured me and elected me as President of the All-India Muslim League this year. I can only say, as I have repeatedly said, that if there is any call from you for any opportunity to serve, with my heart and soul, Muslim India and the cause for which we stand, I shall neither falter nor hesitate to obey. You know that it is now more than seven years since we undertook the revival, the reorganisation and the re-vitalisation of the All-India Muslim League. I think, without exaggeration, it is an undeniable fact that in these seven strenuous years, and in the struggle we have gone through for the last seven years, we have made remarkable progress, which has been admitted by our friends, by our admirers, and even by our opponents to-day.

You have shown not only to India, but to the whole world, and fully established, that we are a nation and that we shall never rest content until we seize the territory that belongs to us and rule over it.

The struggle is a long one, and is a hard one. It requires of you all—let me tell you, and especially those who get impatient and who get into a frame of desperation or despair—to realize that the struggle is a long and hard one; and it calls upon every one of you—especially, I now address the youth—for patience, hard work, steady progress in the building up of this great nation to which we belong. I caution that every step has got to be considered from various points of view before we take one step, and the next before one.

* Presidential address delivered by M.A. Jinnah at the Karachi Session held in December, 1943.

Well, so far I think you will admit that we have met every manoeuvre, every machination, every scheme and design to break us, with success every time. I do not want to give you the whole story; I shall just run through it. We have survived the opposition, which came first from the Government and the bureaucracy when we undertook to reorganize our movement. Public memory is not always very strong and is very fleeting, and therefore, I think it will be better to repeat it here : that first opposition came from the bureaucracy, and for reasons of their own, that opposition was slackened.

Then came the terrific onslaught from the Congress mass contacts and challenges. When the Congress Ministries were formed, the Muslim League was an anathema to them. The Muslim League was ordered to liquidate itself. The members of the Muslim League were told to abjure their allegiance to this body before the Congress could even touch them. Elections, then disruptions were created amongst the Muslims, one after another, Congress Musalmans, Jamiat-ul-Ulema, Ahrar, Azad Conference, Momins, Shias, Sunnis. Every effort was made to destroy the Muslim League, but every effort to cause disruptions in the Muslim League rebounded upon them as a boomerang, as the Muslim nation knew where their true course to follow was. Yet even to-day we are not left in peace, though their methods have changed a bit. Their methods are subtle, insidious, and intended to ply underground and undermine the League.

Shock-Proof—United in Ideal and Thought

In the course of my speech, I shall have to refer to this later on. But I think that I am not exaggerating when I say the Muslim League and Muslim India have now become shock-proof, slogan-proof and stunt-proof. In fact, it is proof against every machination. I would most respectfully advise our opponents, be they Congress or Hindu leadership or the British : you cannot break us—you will never be able to break us now. The sooner they realize this, the better. Do not meddle with our affairs.

If you want to come to terms with us, we are always ready and willing to come to terms with the British Government or the Hindus on honourable terms and on no other terms.

Well, ladies and gentleman, we have gone through, as I said, all these seven years of struggle, and the time has now come for us to examine our balance-sheet and take stock. To-day there is not the slightest doubt that it is acknowledged the world over that the Muslim League is the only authoritative and representative organization of Muslim India. We have got millions and millions of Musalmans behind us; we have got our flag and our platform, and what is more, our definite goal of Pakistan. We have created a complete unity of ideal and thought. About that there can be no doubt whatsoever. We are completly united in our ideals and in our thoughts.

Unity of Action

Now has come the stage when it is absolutely essential that we undertake further steps and start an organizational machinery : directive, efficient and effective for action. We must prepare ourselves. Just as we have after seven years, established our unity of ideals and unity of thought, so we must in the next period of our programme, establish complete unity of action. Now, before you take any action, you must be qualified for it. And what are the necessary requisites which would qualify you for effective action?

First, you must undertake, in real earnest, a constructive programme for the uplift of our people, educationally, socially, economically and politically. It is now for you, the delegates of the All-India Muslim League, who are here from all parts of India, to apply your minds seriously to these questions. I know we have not got an air force; I know we have not got tanks; I know we have not got any army; I know we have not got any navy. You will get all that. You may not require it even. There may be no need for it provided you have the will and determination and unfaltering faith and unity, and faith in your cause. You will achieve your

goal provided you organize yourselves thoroughly and efficiently.

Therefore, I urge upon you at this session that it is most essential to take the next step to set up an organizational machinery.

It is for you to consider this in the Subjects Committee. I can only put my views before you. But I suggest that now the work of the Muslim League organization has grown beyond the physical capacity of any single man. If you were to know what I have to attend to all alone, you would be astonished. All over India—to-day this thing happening in Patna, to-morrow that thing happening in Bengal; day after to-morrow this thing happening in the N.W.F.P., day after that thing happening in Madras. All sorts of questions arise from day to day and from week to week. Now it is not possible for one single man to do justice to all this.

And remember the position of Muslim India, if I can explain by analogy, is this : When a man is sick and almost dying, he has not got the energy either to complain or to ask for anything. He is practically unconscious of what is happening around him, and he does not care what is going to happen to him, the world or anybody else. He is in a semi-unconscious state or almost on the point of death. That sick man on the deathbed has not the energy to say anything and cannot do anything. He has not got the energy even to complain. That was the condition of Muslim India seven years ago; but to-day, the sick man has recovered from his deathbed, He has acquired consciousness. He is not only convalescent but he is in a position to move about. Now he has got so many suggestions and proposals to make, so many disputes and so many quarrels to settle. It is a good sign, provided it is kept within limits. It is a very good sign of a healthy man. I get some suggestions which are splendid ones and thoughtful ones and very good, too. I get complaints and petty quarrels, which I do not like. But anyhow it is a healthy sign. In one word, let me put it to you this way. I am thank-

ful to God that Muslim India is awake—I am thankful that Muslim India has regained consciousness. I am thankful that Muslim India is taking interest in things around it, not only in India, but throughout the world. I am thankful that Muslim India is taking an intelligent interest in everything that is going on now.

I am asked why the Muslim League should not establish a complete machinery and bureau to set up national industries for Muslim India all over India, and especially in Pakistan. Why should we not undertake planning? Why should we not undertake the establishment of big and heavy industries in Pakistan? Why whould the Muslim League not undertake the planning of a national system of education? I am only giving just a few instances—I have got so many of them that I could go on mentioning them till midnight, but I shall not do that.

Committee of Action

All these proposals, suggestions and demands are pouring in. As I say, this is a very good sign. Now, we are also self-conscious. We are also alive to the stage that we have reached. My humble advice to the delegates of the All-India Muslim League is this : we may not be able to achieve or realize all these demands at once, nor can we immediately put into operation all the various suggestions and proposals, but the stage has come when it is absolutely essential that you must have a Committee of Action, a Committee consisting of not less than five and not more than seven. It should be the function of this Committee, not only to organize, further organize, co-ordinate and unify as an All India policy, but also to examine the various demands and proposals and suggestions that come from time to time.

In other words, we want a Committee with a Secretariat. I, therefore, ask you, brother delegates, to consider this question most seriously.

It is true we are not flushed with money. In a way, my

expectations have not been realized. I made an appeal for funds. I think the Muslims could have done it. But still it has not happened. I made an appeal for funds totalling at least Rs. 10,00,000. That was more than a year and nine months, or very nearly two years, ago. Anyhow, I have received some support. I have been getting some encouragement. Up to the present moment I have realized about Rs. 5,50,000 Well, this money is not collected for the purpose of investment. This money is not collected for the purpose of multiplying it. But this money is collected for the purpose of helping the Muslim League organization and development. I am sure we shall get more funds. Of that I am confident. But we need not wait till we get more. Let us at least do something with what we have got. We are in a position now to set up an efficient secretariat and this Committee of Action.

Next, you know that Parliamentary activities are growing. We are, as you know, fighting by-elections sometimes. We had by-elections in the North-West Frontier Province. We had a by-election only recently in Shikarpur. Now, with regard to your Parliamentary activities, it is absolutely essential and necessary that there should be a supreme body. For that purpose, again, my respectful suggestion is that you should have an All-India Parliamentary Board consisting of three persons. I tell you why. A number of candidates apply for the ticket of the All-India Muslim League. Some of them are rejected—may be rightly, may be wrongly. When disputes arise, there is no machinery of a standing character that can be approached at once and can be appealed to, intervene and to do justice.

You know that in local affairs there are certain prejudices. You know that very often familiarity breeds contempt and distrust. This is so not only in India but everywhere else. You know there are local intrigues and cliques. At present our machinery is not efficient, and therefore it cannot work efficiently. At present the Working Committee of the Provincial Muslim League is the authority for the purpose of giving the Muslim League ticket to candidates for various elections—

not only the elections to the Assembly or the Upper House—such as in Bengal, where there are two Houses—but with regard to Municipalities, District Boards and Local Boards. In some of the Provinces, the Working Committees have appointed Parliamentary Boards.

But, ladies and gentlemen, as you know, even in an ordinary litigation, the litigants are not satisfied unless they can go to the Privy Council. There is always the subordinate judge or the district judge, and there is the High Court and there is the Privy Council. Well, people get more satisfied when they go to the High Court, because it is a detached body, away from local surroundings and the local atmosphere. People are still more satisfied—even the losing party is more satisfied—when they get a decision from the Privy Council, because it is a detached body. Similarly, it is necessary that we should have a final court of appeal as a detached body of three persons who would be appointed by the All-India authority of the Muslim League.

Therefore, these two bodies are absolutely essential, and we must not lose any time in creating and appointing these two bodies.

No doubt there are many other questions, which will require our consideration—educational planning, economic planning, social planning. These are very big questions; but once you have set up a Committee of five or seven, believe me it will be the beginning of the examination of all these various questions, and there will then be an efficient machinery which will be able to direct, guide and control all these various suggestions, and if possible put them into practice. That stage has come. These are my concrete suggestions to you for further strengthening, further organizing, further consolidating and further creating more strength, more power, more vigour in the organization of the All-India Muslim League.

The Food Problem

The next question that I would like to place before you is

the food problem. Ladies and gentlemen, I must tell you that I called a meeting of the five Premiers from the dominant Muslim League Ministries and dominant Muslim Provinces. I invited them to meet me in Delhi about the 15th or 16th of November. They were all good enough to come, except the Premier of Assam, Sir Saadullah. But then he wrote expressing his inability, and deputed Mr. A. Matin Chowdhry, his colleague and a Minister in the Assam Government. Amongst other things that I had to consult them about, this food problem was discussed with them at great length. Let me tell you there was entire agreement among all these five provinces. It is absolutely untrue—as misrepresented in a certain section of the press—that they were divided.

It is further absolutely untrue that Lord Wavell took the wind out of our sails by summoning them over my head while they were in Delhi. It is after full discussion and after agreement that we ourselves asked Lord Wavell to meet the Premiers and discuss the food problem. He was good enough to give an immediate appointment and time the very next day. It is in consequence of that arrangement that the Muslim League Premiers had an interview with Lord Wavell. It is utterly false to say that there was any difference of opinion. It is utterly false to say that Lord Wavell upset my machinations. There were no machinations at all. Ours is a plain, honest, straightforward position. It was this, that so far as the food trouble in India was concerned, knowing as we did the conditions and the Constitution of the Government of India, we were ready and willing—for very good reasons and obvious reasons. and, above all, in the name of Humanity—to do everything in our power to avert the scourge of famine and the shadow of death and prevent a recurrence of it anywhere in this country.

Fair Deal for the Farmer

Actuated by this motive, the whole situation was discussed. It is not at all true that these provinces, or any one of them represented by the Muslim Premiers, are not fully alive to

their sense of responsibility, or are actuated by any vested interests. The real issue was, ladies and gentlemen, not that we did not recognize the efficacy of control; not that we did not recognize the efficacy of procurement; not that we did not recognize the efficacy of rationing; not that we did not recognize that under the present system of government and the conditions under which we are living, there must be a uniform policy—the real issue (and that real issue is not clearly understood) was : Are the agriculturists and the producers of food-grains to be bled to fatten the industrialists? Is there going to be one rule of justice for one class or one interest, and another rule of justice and fair play for another class and another interest?

What we urged, and what we still urge, is that if you want to control food grains, you must equally, in all earnestness and sincerity, control the prices of all other essential articles and essential ingredients which are necessary for the existence of the very man, the agriculturist, whom you want to control.

Let me put it to you this way. To day I am a producer; I am an agriculturist. You say to me look here, before the war, or even sometime after the war, you got only Re. 1 for a seer or whatever of food. I am going to give you Rs 3 for the same measure. Well, what are you giving me? When I got that Rupee before the war or even for some time after the war, that Re. 1 had the purchasing power not of Rs. 3 of to-day but of Rs. 4 of to-day. What is the good of your giving me three notes of one rupee each, when on going to buy my necessaries of life, these three rupees of mine are not equal to the old rupee but only to 12 annas?

Therefore, you don't count in terms of currency or number of notes, but count in terms of the value of your currency paper and its purchasing power in the bazar for the necessaries of life. That is the real issue. That is the issue which the Government of India have got to tackle. Unless they come out with a clear-cut and honest policy of giving a fair deal to

all interests, it is no use oppressing only the agriculturist and the producer and giving undue advantages to other interests at the cost of farmers.

The Political Situation

Ladies and gentlemen, the next question that I wish to deal with is the political situation in the country. So far as the political situation in the country is concerned, addressing the Council of the All-India Muslim League last November, I said that there was no change and nothing new had happened. The position to-day before you briefly is this. The British Government are playing. This is more or less clear, and has repeatedly been made clear. They say one thing at one time and another thing at another time. The net result is that they tell the Musalmans: "We are not against Pakistan, it is the Hindus who are against it." They tell the Hindus, "We are not against Akhand Hindustan, it is the Musalmans who are against it." They are, it seems only, in favour of one thing—to see how their own raj should continue. But so far as the Hindus and Musalmans are concerned—I put it to you again, ladies and gentlemen, if my voice can go beyond this pandal to those who are also really honest and sincere well-wishers of the peoples of India—can we, Muslim India, accept Akhand Hindustan and Hindu Raj over this entire Subcontinent ?

It is possible to expect us, unless we are unconscious—and we were unconscious before the war, but now we are fully conscious—to expect Muslim India to agree to Akhand Hindustan and Hindu Raj in this Subcontinent ? But that is the proposal, and they have not yet given up their dreams. On the other hand, there is the talk of independence. I ask, "Whose independence?" I warn you, and I have repeatedly warned you, they mean the independence of Hindu India and the slavery of Muslim India. Now what do we say? We say, "Pakistan."

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask any intelligent man, if he would only apply his mind for one second, "Can you achieve Pakistan without the independence of India?" When we say

Pakistan, we mean not our independence only, but the independence of Hindus also.

If the Hindu, owing to his obsession, dream, or cussedness, still puts obstructions in the way of the freedom of both, and insists upon the freedom of one and the slavery of the other, then I ask you, "Who is the man, who is the party, except the Hindus, who are responsible for holding up the progress of this country?" Well, that has been obvious for a long time. But for the pronouncements of Lord Wavell, the present Viceroy, there would have been nothing new. Lord Wavell made a speech recently at the Associated Chambers of Commerce meeting at Calcutta, as is the custom and tradition of every Viceroy to make important annoucements at the Calcutta Chamber of Commerce, a foreign corporation. He, in his speech, has said what was already more or less clear, although the previous Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, indulged in subtleties and embellishments.

The Plain Language of Lord Wavell

Mr. Amery preached to the world about the attitude and the policy of the British Government regarding the Indian constitutional problem with great finesse. Recently Mr. Amery made it clear through somebody that the principles of the Atlantic Charter were made applicable to India 18 months before the Atlantic Ocean produced the Atlantic Charter. But that was, as I said, full of the subtleties, embellishments and finesse which these two great statesmen practised. The soldier-like Viceroy, Lord Wavell, has spoken in plain language so that even a man in the street can understand. I think those of you who have read that speech know where you stand and how you stand. In that respect Lord Wavell has made a great contribution to the political problem of India. What does he say? Of course, his mental bag, he probably found it necessary to jettison in the Mediterranean before he crossed the Suez Canal, and he is no more embarrassed by this bag.

What does he say now? He says, "I do not believe that political differences can be solved by administrative actions or

by talking about them at present. I am quite sure they cannot be solved by talking. I am quite sure they cannot be solved by administrative actions either." There is nothing new about that. The Viceroy then says that he still believes that he can solve all immediate economic problems. He also believes that he can materially tackle the post-war reconstruction and the food problems. So having put the political issue in cold storage for all practical purposes, or at any rate indefinitely—although he does not say that it is put in cold storage till after the war—he proceeds to say : "I am concentrating on the job we have to do." What is the job or work that he has to do? Winning he war is number one.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is really astonishing that he, the representative of the Crown, speaking with responsibility and in all seriousness, thinks that he can win this war while he is totally indifferent to the political situation in India. What is happening in this world? Is the British Government not concerned with winning the war? What happened when the Lebanon question came? What happened when the Syrian question came? Were all these political adjustments made from merely the humanitarian point of view? What happened when the difference took place between the French in Algiers? What is happening in other parts of the world?

Ladies and gentlemen, it is really astonishing, it is sheer blindness to say, 'My job is only to win the war'. To win the war and how? With all humility, I say to the British Government, "You have got to get the whole-hearted and enthusiastic support of some party in this country, if not of all."

The next thing the Viceroy is going to do is the organization of the economic home-front. How is he going to do that? He tells you how he is going to do it. He says that amongst the jobs that he has to do is the economic home-front and preparations for peace by using all resources which India has in determination, energy and intelligence. May I know, how he is going to get all the resources of India in determination, energy and intelligence, when every party is kept at arms

length, discontented and dissatisfied? But this is how he is going to accomplish it. He says : "For this purpose (wining the war) the economic home-front, the post-war reconstruction and mobilizing the resources of India in determination, energy and intelligence), I would welcome co-operation from anyone or anybody." I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, is this really not a flagrant abuse of the English word, 'Co-operation'? What co-operation? Does it not, in plain language, mean that without giving any part, any real share in the authority of the Government, we are asked to do the work of camp-followers, menials and subservients? Can you expect any self-respecting organization to accept that position?

Even if we were so foolish as to fall in with this fantastic suggestion, can any intelligent man believe that we can ever succeed in putting real enthusiasm into the people and secure their whole-hearted and genuine support and cooperation ? Can we succeed in making them war minded, when we are invited to assist the Viceroy as camp-followers, as menials or as subservients ? It is amazing, this complacency with which these pronouncements are made. Does it not really mean, in plain language, that the British Government are pursuing a definite policy and they do not want the co-operation of any party—it does not matter which party it is. The Congress has decided to non-co-operate. The Congress has decided to resort to mass civil disobedience if their demands are not conceded. The Congress has been outlawed. What has the rest of India done that you should talk to them in this language, which nobody can tolerate or even understand ?

Divide and Quit

We have, time and again, made it clear—we have offered our hand of co-operation for the job or work that Lord Wavell wants to do, provided our hand is accepted as that of a confident friend with a share, a real share, in the authority of the Government, and with a definite promise that we shall get our share in the fruits of victory when we win it. That has been rejected. They speak of organizations—the Congresss, the

Hindu organization which represents, no doubt, the solid body of Hindu opinion, and the Muslim League which represents the solid body of Muslim opinion. They have outlawed the one. Well, I suppose they would like to outlaw the Muslim League also. We are quite ready for it.

Why do you, dishonestly and falsely, bracket these organizations together and treat them on the same basis and beat them with the same stick ? That is my complaint. It is not honest. I am of the opinion that this policy that is pursued by the British Government—after all, Lord Wavell is only acting according (what shall I say ?) to the instrument of instructions of the British policy which has already been decided—this British policy, is going to prove disastrous. You know, Mr. Churchill, some time ago, said that he was not called or summoned to be the First Minister of the King to liquidate the British Empire.

Now, I can tell him this, that voluntary liquidation is more honourable than a compulsory one.

It will redound to the honour of the British nation, and it will be recognized by us an act of friendship, which has got its value and assets in the future. But compulsory liquidation will have none of those advantages, and the British Empire will have to be liquidated one day, whether you like it or not. I will only trouble you with one quotation, as it is rather interesting. This is what John Bright said in 1858. John Bright was making his speech on the India Bill introduced in Parliament on the occasion of the assumption of sovereignty over India by the British Queen. In that speech he said :

"How long does England propose to govern India ? No body can answer. Maybe, 50 or 100 or 500 years. Does any man with the smallest glimmering of common sense believe that so great a country with its 20 different nations and 20 different languages, can ever be bound up and consolidated into one compact and enduring empire ? I believe such a thing to be utterly impossible. We must fail in the attempt if ever we make it, and we are bound to look into the future

with reference to that point. The Madras Presidency, for instance, having its own Government, would in 50 years become one compact State, and every part of the Presidency would look to the city of Madras as its capital, and to the Government of Madras as its ruling power. If that were to go on for a century or more, there would be five or six presidencies of India, built up into so many compact States, and if at any future period, the sovereignty of England should be withdrawn, we should leave so many presidencies built up and firmly compacted together, each able to support its own independence and its own Government, and we should be able to say we had not left the country a prey to that anarchy and discord which is to be inevitable if we insist on holding those vast territories with the idea of building them up into one great empire."

This is what John Bright said in 1858. After 85 years we are now impressing upon the successors to those great British statesmen that the only way, the only honest way for Great Britain is to divide and quit. Unity can only be realized on the basis of division of property and possessions between the respective two nations, the Hindus and the Musalmans. The other minorities will be the acid test. It will be the sacred, solemn duty of Pakistan and Hindustan to safeguard, to protect, to give a fair and just deal to the minorities who would be under two zones.

The Congress and the Communists

Well now we come to the Congress and Hindu leadership. Gentlemen, I see no change except a parrot-like cry. I find that the cleverest party that is carrying on propaganda are the Communists. They have got so many flags, and I think they consider that there is safety in number. They have got the Red flag; they have got the Russian flag; they have got the Soviet flag; they have got the Congress flag. And now they have been good enough to introduce our flag also. Well, when a man has got too many flags, I get suspicious. They shout that they want a Congress-League settlement. Who

says no ? But the question is, on what basis ? It is no use repeating this parrot-like cry that they want a Congress-League settlement. On what basis ?

Mr. Gandhi, in the letter he wrote to Lord Linlithgow on January 19, 1943, as a part of the correspondence between him and the ex-Viceroy, says : "If I could be convinced of my error, or worse if I should need to consult nobody, so far as my own action is concerned, to make a full and open confession and make ample amends. But I have not any conviction of error. I wonder if you saw my letter to the Secretary to the Government of India of September 23, 1942. I adhere to what I have said in it and in my letter to you of August 14, 1942."

Well now this was in January 1943. Am I wrong, am I doing an injustice if I say that the clear meaning of this letter is that when Mr. Gandhi wrote it, he stood every inch by the August 1942 Resolution and the policy and the demand made in that Resolution? I do not want to worry you unnecessarily. But those of you who have read that Resolution must come to this conclusion—there is no other conclusion, for Mr. Gandhi and the Congress, not only did not consult the Muslim League, but quite ignored the Muslim League that it was a definite, determined and deliberate attempt to by-pass the Muslim League and to force the hands of the British Government to surrender to their demands, which would mean death to the Muslim demands. Mr. Gandhi in his letter of January 1943, in effect says, 'I stick to my guns'.

Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, if Mr. Gandhi stick to his guns, and if he is holding a pistol at us, not at the British only, but at us, and wants to bypass us and there is no change in his policy, may I ask any man with common sense, "What is the basis on which any negotiations can proceed and can fructify into any reasonable settlement?" Has there been any change since January 1943? Is there any indication or sign of it? Millions of Congressmen are outside the jail. On the contrary, they have been contemplating the form of govern-

ment that could be based on the ancient culture and the political system which prevailed in the days of that great Hindu historic period of Vikramaditya. I ask any sensible man, any fair-minded man, how is it possible for us to accept that position?

A few isolated Hindu leaders have shown some sort of sympathy with our point of view. But when they talk, they talk in a language of subtlety. In fact, to begin with, they are afraid to use the word 'Pakistan'. They prefer to use the phraseology of 'self-determination'. When they talk of self-determination, they talk about it with their tongue in their cheek, and wind up by saying, 'Well, we are willing to go as far as possible.' In the same breath, when responsible Hindu leaders speak in this dubious language, they turn against us, and we are told that we are non-co operating with the Congress, if we don't agree with them. I ask you, "Is there any iota of truth in that?" It is the other way. It is the Congress which is responsible and which forced us to defend our rights and ourselves.

To start with, it is the Congress that would not touch the League with a pair of tongs. It is the Congress to whom the League is an anathema. They corrupted Musalmans, by offering Ministries to give up the League; they picked up any Muslim who was willing to abuse the League, and demanded that the Muslim League should be liquidated. That is the Congress.

So far as we are concerned, it is not a question of non-co-operation. It is a question of defence against the attitude the Congress has taken up since 1937, to dominate Musalmans and to establish, by hook or by crook, Hindu Raj and Hindu Government. We are defending ourselves against that monstrosity, those machinations and those designs. It is not a question of non-co-operation at all. Then again we are told politely, but again most untruthfully, that our demands are impossible. We are not told what is the impossible demand that we are making. But we are told this, that Hindus will

begin to prefer to make the best of things as they stand at present, rather than agree to what they honestly deem to be our unreasonable demands.

So rather than agree to what they consider our unreasonable demands, the Hindus will, and are ready to, accept the British Raj. We are not told what our unreasonable demand is—what makes them so desperate, except that we refuse to accept or agree to the establishment of Hindu Raj? Then we are told that signs are indeed not wanting; from which we may infer that this process has already begun, the process that the Hindus are ready and willing to accept the British Raj.

Lastly, we are told that our indifference to the goal of independence—'we are indifferent to the goal of independence', mark these words—would lead the Muslim youth to rebel against the League. Now, is this not subtle? Is this not suggesting that we are indifferent to the goal of independence? Is it not slighting the Muslim youth to say that their elder politicians are indifferent to the goal of independence? Let me tell you from this platform that this is a vicious, sinister, wicked propaganda to incite the Muslim youth against the League. There is no truth whatsoever in the suggestion that we are reconciled to the British Raj. On the contrary, we are told by this authority that signs are, indeed, not wanting that the Hindus are willing to accept British Raj rather than come to a settlement with us. The Hindu leader that has said all this is Mr. Rajagopalachari. You will find it in his pamphlet entitled, The Way Out.

A Beginning Towards Pakistan

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that is the position so far as Hindu opinion is concerned. Now all I can say to you is this. We cannot depend upon any one, and we do not depend upon any one. It is only by our own inherent strength, by our work, by our service, by our sacrifices, that we shall achieve this goal of ours—Pakistan. Hindus cannot give you Pakistan. The utmost that the Hindu can do is not to obstruct you, so that

he may get his freedom and you may get your freedom. That is the utmost that he can do—withdraw his obstruction, with a reasonable chance of his getting his freedom and our getting our freedom. The British Government can give it, because they are in possession. Whether they make up their mind to give, or whether they do not make up their mind to give, or whether they go on camouflaging, evading and putting for ward plausible excuses, I am confident that, with all their diplomacy, with all their great genius in bamboozling people, in befooling people, we are now shock-proof even against the diplomacy of the British Government. They cannot, and will not be able to, prevent us from seizing Pakistan.

We have made a beginning. It is a small beginning. It is not for the sake of getting jobs for our people as Ministers that we are approving those Ministries being formed and functioning where Musalmans are in the majority. We have taken the first step. These Ministries are there, because of the Muslim League behind them. It is the Muslim League, through its agents, that has seized such power—limited power—as there is. This is only a part which will make a contribution to the whole of our organizational field. If our Ministers properly utilize such powers as they possess, limited as they are, they can, if they are so minded, galvanize, consolidate, unify and make the Muslim League a living force in those provinces. At the same time, they can immediately undertake measures of an ameliorative character and a constructive programme, not with a view to do injustice to the minorities, but for ameliorative purposes of their provinces. Socially, educationally, economically, they can, within these limited powers, render great services to their respective provinces if they are so minded. Well, we are trying the experiment. Let us see what emerges from this laboratory.

In conclusion, I say to you, to everyone—man, woman and child, young and old—stand unflinchingly, without faltering. In Pakistan lies our destiny.

18

IMPORTANT RESOLUTIONS

(Adopted at the Sessions of Muslim League)

(DACCA SESSION, 1906)

Resolved—That this meeting, composed of Musalmans from all parts of India assembled at Dacca. decides that a Political Association styled the 'All-India Moslem League' be formed for the furtherance of the following objects :

(a) To promote among the Musalmans of India feeling of loyalty to the British Government and to remove any misconceptions that may arise to the intentions of Government with regard to any of its measures.

(b) To protect and advance the political rights and interests of the Musalmans of India and respectfully to represent their needs and aspirations to Government.

(c) To prevent the rise among the Musalmans of India of any feelings of hostility towards other communities without prejudice to the other objects of the League.

(ALIGARH SESSION, 1908)

In particular the League would invite attention to the following matters :

(a) The imperative necessity which exists in India for the appointment of a Mohammedan Judge to each of the High Courts and Chief Courts of the country where such appointment has not already been made.

(b) The urgent need for giving the Mohammedans their

share of appointments in the various branches of the Public Service, inasmuch as the existing disparity as regards numbers between Mohammedans and the members of other communities in Government Service has resulted in unduly depressing the status of the former, and, if allowed to continue, would tend to intensify the dissatisfaction caused by the present state of things.

(c) The vital importance of the adequate representation of Mohammedans as a distinct community on the Legislative Councils, both Imperial and Provincial, and also on municipal, district and local boards throughout the country by enabling Mohammedan voters to elect their own representatives on these Boards.

(d) The Great desirability of safeguarding Mohammedan educational interests by securing the due representation of Mohammedans on the Syndicates and Senates of the Indian Universities and on the Textbook Committee connected with the Department of Public Instruction.

(AMRITSAR SESSION, 1908)

Resolution III

That whereas the language of paragraph 12 of the Despatch of the Secretary of State dealing with the Scheme of Reform of Councils is such as has possibly engendered in the mind of some of the loyal Indian Mohammedans the incorrect impression that the paragraph in question suggests the grant of separate and denominational representation to the Mohammedans of India; and whereas the All-India Muslim League regards such impression to be solely due to an optimism that proceeds from the unqualified trust the Indian Mohammedans have traditionally reposed in the justice and impartiality of the British · vernment, the All-India Muslim League deems it to be its duty to deplore the vagueness of the language of

that paragraph, and most regretfully construes it to mean that the scheme of representation of the minorities contained in the said paragraph does not and cannot secure the protection which is intended to be given to such communities, as the creation of non-denominational electorates whether original or intermediary, precludes the possibility of the successful election of the real representatives of minorities, and that mere reservation of a certain number of seats on Imperial and Provincial Councils in favour of such communities without any system of denominational representation from the first voting units to the representatives in the Council Chambers will end in the return of such members of minorities as are only mandatories of majorities and that under the circumstances the All-India Muslim League views the suggestion in paragraph 12 of the said Despatch with great alarm, and have grave apprehensions that in their present form they are sure to create dire disappointment in the Mohammedan community, and that unless materially altered to suit their requirements, the essentials of which are representation on a purely denominational basis, they will mark the first breakdown of that implicit faith which Musalmans have so long placed in the care and solicitude of Government whose just pride and profession have been to hold the scales even.

Resolution XIII

The All India Muslim League deplores the spirit of recent anti-Asiatic legislation in the British colonies of South Africa, especially in the Transvaal, which has placed a great strain on the loyalty of our countrymen, both here and in such colonies, and considers it as one of its bounden duties to the British Government, as well as to its African colonies concerned, to inform it of the likely mischievous consequences of colonial legislation, based on racial distinction, humiliating to H.M. the King Emperor's Indian subjects; and this League has grave apprehensions that unless the good sense of the colonies helps them to devise means to end the present crisis in such colonies by some permanent compromise, and failing that, unless the Imperial Government successfully asserts its undoubted supre-

macy in matters of Imperial importance to obliterate racial distinctions in political life within the Empire, the reforms foreshadowed in the Despatch of the Secretary of State for India may fail to exercise that wholesome influence on the present situation in India which they are intended to exercise.

(*DELHI SESSION, 1910*)

Resolution I

The All-India Muslim League places on record its deep sense of appreciation of the just and beneficial Scheme of Reform embodied in the Indian Councils Act and the regulations framed thereunder, and offers, on behalf of Indian Musalmans, its grateful thanks to the Government, and assures it of their cordial co-operation with the Government and other communities for the success of the scheme.

Resolution III

In view of the necessity and importance, under the existing circumstances of India, of each community being fully represented in the administration, the All-India Muslim League considers the number of Mohammedans employed in the various branches of the public service absolutely inadequate, and strongly urges the Government to give the Mohammedan community that share in the public service to which it is entitled by reason of its importance and numerical strength.

Resolution IV

The All-India Muslim League is of opinion that the principle of communal representation should be extended to all self-governing bodies, as promised by H.E. the Viceroy, in his reply to the All-India Mohammedan Deputation, and respectfully points out to Government that the adequate and effective representation of the Mohammedans is a necessary corollary of its application in the Imperial and Provincial Councils, and essential to the successful working of the Reform Scheme.

Resolution VIII

The All-India Muslim League strongly reiterates the necessity of a separate Mohammedan university of their own for the Indian Musalmans and emphasizes the desirablity and advantages of raising the M.A.O. College, Aligarh, to the status of such a university.

(NAGPUR SESSION, 1910)

Resolution III

The All-India Muslim League tenders its sincere thanks to His Majesty the King-Emperor, the Right Hon'ble the Secretary of State and His Excellency the Viceroy for the liberal confirmation of the principle of having an Indian on the Imperial Executive Council, and further begs to express its cordial sense of obligation for the recognition of the communal interests of the Musalmans by elevating the Hon'ble Syed Ali Imam to the legal membership, who, the All-India Muslim League feels sure, will prove a source of strength to the Government of India.

Resolution IV

The All-India Muslim League place on record its deep appreciation of the sterling services rendered by Lord Minto, during a period of stress and storm, to the cause of Indian progress during his tenure of office, by his far-reaching Scheme of Reforms, the association of Indians in the real government of the country, and statesman-like recognition of the just claims of the Musalman community for its proper share in the administration of the country.

Resolution V

The All-India Muslim League respectfully places on record its deep appreciation of the masterly and statesman-like manner in which the Right Hon'ble Viscount Morley of Blackburn has guided the destinies of His Majesty's Indian Empire in a period of storm and stress, never departing in spirit from the best liberal

traditions, and expresses its deep sense of gratitude to him for associating Indians in the real government of the country, and courageously inaugurating a system of reform whilst the country was seething with discontent, and in that connection doing justice to the claims of His Majesty's Musalman subjects.

Resolution VI

The All-India Muslim League once again records its deliberate opinion that in the interests of the Musalman community, it is absolutely necessary that the principal of communal representation be extended to all self-governing public bodies, and respectfully urges that a provision for the adequate and effective representation of the Musalmans on municipal and district boards is a necessary corollary of the application of the principle to the Imperial and Provincial Legislative Councils and, at the same time, essential to the successful working not only of the Reform Scheme, but also of those public bodies themselves.

Resolution XXI

In view of the necessity and importance under the existing circumstances of India, of each community being duly represented in the administration the All-India Muslim League reiterates its resolution of last year that the number of Mohammedans employed in the various branches of the public service is absolutely inadequate, and strongly urges the Government to give the Mohammedan community that share in the public service to which it is entitled by reason of its importance and numerical strength, the League being of opinion that a sufficient number of qualified Mohammedans is available for the purpose.

(*CALCUTTA SESSION, 1912*)

The All-India Muslim League places on record its deep sense of regret and disappointment at the annulment of the partition of Bengal in utter disregard of Muslim feelings, and

trusts that Government will take early steps to safeguard Muslim interests in the Presidency of Bengal.

Muslim League Council Session

(*BANKIPUR, DECEMBER 31, 1912*)

A resolution was passed which recommended that the aims of the Muslim League should be :

1. To promote and maintain among Indians feelings of loyalty towards the British Crown;
2. To protect and advance the political and other rights and interests of the Indian Musalmans;
3. To promote friendship and union between the Musalmans and other communities of India; and
4. Without detriment to the foregoing objects, the attainment of a system of self-government suitable to India by bringing about, through constitutional means, a steady reform of the existing system of administration; by promoting national unity and fostering public spirit among the people of India, and by co-operating with other communities for the said purposes.

(*LUCKNOW SESSION, 1913*)

Resolution IV

The All-India Muslim League is of opinion that the present system of recruitment by open competitive examination held in England for the Indian Civil Service entails great injustice to the Indian subjects of His Majesty, and expresses the hope that the Royal Commission on the Public Services will be able to devise a system of recruitment equally suitable to the various sections of His Majesty's subjects in India and in Great Britain.

Resolution V

The All-India Muslim League, in view of the persistent and

unanimous demand on the part of all sections of the people of India for the separation of executive and judicial functions, is of opinion that the Government should be pleased to tak early steps to bring into effect the desired reform.

Resolution VII

The All-India Muslim League once again records its deliberate opinion that in the interests of the Musalman community, it is absolutely necessary that the principle of communal representation be extended to all self-governing public bodies, and respectfully urges that a provision for the adequate and effective representation of the Musalmans on municipal and district boards is a necessary corollary of the application of the principle to the Imperial and the Provincial Legislative Councils, and at the same time essential to the successful working of those public bodies.

Resolution VIII

The All-India Muslim League places on record its firm belief that the future development and progress of the people of India depend exclusively on the harmonious working and co-operation of the various communities; deprecates all mischievous attempts to widen the unfortunate breach between the Hindus and Musalmans; and hopes that the leaders on both sides will periodically meet together to restore the amicable relations prevailing between them in the past and find a *modus operandi* for joint and concerted action in questions of the public good.

(*AGRA SESSION, 1913*)

Resolution V

The All-India Muslim League once again records its deliberate opinion that in the interests of the Musalman community, it is absolutely necessary that the principle of communal representation be extended to all self-governing public bodies, and respectfully urges that a provision for the

adequate and effective representation of Musalmans on municipal and district boards is a necessary corollary of the application of the principle to the Imperial and Provincial Legislative Councils, and at the same time essential to the successful working of those public bodies.

Resolution XV

That the Council of the Secretary of State be reconstituted on the following lines : (a) That the salary of the Secretary of State for India should be placed on the English estimates. (b) That with a view to the efficiency and independence of the Council, it is expedient that it should be partly nominated and partly elected. (c) That the total number of members of Council should be nine. (d) That the elected portion of the Council should consist of not less than one-third of the total number of members who should be non-official Indians chosen by a constituency consisting of elected members of the Imperial and Provincial Legislative Councils. (e) That not less than one-half of the nominated portion of the Council should consist of public men of merit and ability unconnected with the Indian administration. (f) That the remaining portion of the nominated Council should consist of officials who have served in India for not less than ten years and have not been away from India for more than two years. (g) That the character of the Council should be advisory and not administrative. (h) That the term of office of each member should be five years.

(*BOMBAY SESSION, 1915-16*)

Resolution VI

The All-India Muslim League, once again, records its deliberate opinion that in the interests of the Musalman Community, it is absolutely necessary that the principle of communal representation be extended to all self-governing public bodies, and respectfully urges that provision for the adequate and effective representation of Musalmans on municipal and district boards is a necessary corollary of the

application of the principle to the Imperial and Provincial Legislative Councils; and at the same time, considers it essential to the successful working of those public bodies.

(LUCKNOW SESSION, 1916)

Resolution II

The All-India Muslim League, while adopting the Scheme of Reforms prepared by the Reform Committee of the League and approved by its Council, submits it in conjuction with the Indian National Congress to the Government for its introduction after the war as the first necessary step towards the establishment of complete self-government in India.

(CALCUTTA SESSION, 1917-18)

Resolution XV

In view of the strong desire of the Muslim community to have definite provisions for the protection of its interests, this League urges upon the Government that the following safeguards be adopted in the forthcoming reforms :

(a) Musalmans should be adequately represented in the public services of the country.

(b) Musalmans should have representation on Government Universities in the same proportion as the representation accorded to Musalmans on the Legislative Council of the province concerned may be.

(c) The Urdu language and Persian character should be maintained in courts and public offices in those provinces where they are in vogue, and Urdu should be employed as the medium of primary education in the aforesaid provinces.

(d) Musalmans should be afforded facilities, protection and help in the observance and performance of

their religious rites, ceremonies and usages on the occasion of *Baqrid, Moharram*, etc., without any restriction by any official or community.

(BOMBAY SESSION, 1918)

Resolution VII

The All-India Muslim League affirms that the introduction of a system of responsible government should proceed simultaneously in the Central as well as the Provincial Governments. The All-India Muslim League while welcoming the Report on India Constitutional Reforms as an earnest attempt to liberalize Indian political institutions, and recognizing that some of the proposals constituted an advance on the present conditions in some directions, is of opinion that the recommendations as a whole are unsatisfactory, and regrets that the scheme fails to appreciate the peculiar position of the Musalmans of India and evinces a want of sympathy with their interests.

The League is further of opinion that the following modification and changes in the proposals are necessary to render the scheme of reforms a substantial step towards responsible government. The proportion of the Musalmans in the Assembly and the Legislative Councils as laid down in the Congress-League Scheme must be maintained The measure of control that Parliament and Secretary of State exercise over Indian affairs should be relaxed as subjects are transferred to popular control, from time to time, and in the case of reserved subjects, the general and financial control of Parliament and the Secretary of State should not be substituted by the control of the Government of India as long as the Government of India is not made fully responsible to the people. The Council of India should be abolished and the Secretary of State should be assisted by two Under-Secretaries, one of whom should always be an Indian. The establishment charges of the India Office should be placed on the British Estimates. The Committee to be appointed to examine and report on the present constitution of the Council of India should contain an

adequate Indian element. The words 'Good Government' in Recommendation 5 of the Report should be either clearly defined or deleted. There should be no Privy Council for India. The Indian element in the Executive Council of the Governor-General should not be less than half of the total number of members. In making such appointments the claims of the Musalmans should be borne in mind.

Power may be taken for the appointment of Under-Secretaries, but the majority of these should be appointed from amongst the elected members of the Legislative Assembly. The total strength of the Legislative Assembly should be 150, of whom four-fifths should be elected. The President and Vice-President of the Legislative Assembly should be elected by the Assembly. The Council of State may be retained, provided that a system of reserved and transferred subjects similar to that proposed for the Provinces is adopted for the Central Government and that in the Legislature of India the certificate of the Governor-General-in-Council should not apply except to certain reserved subjects hereinafter mentioned. The reserved subjects should be confined to the Army, the Navy, Foreign and Political relations between the Government of India and other Powers, excepting relations with the Colonies and Dominions, including the declaration of war and entering into treaties and matters directly affecting the peace, tranquility and safety of the country.

In the Council of State half the members shall be elected, one-third of the elected members being Musalmans to be elected by Muslim constituencies.

The certificate of the Governor-General should not apply to matters other than reserved subjects, and only in cases directly affecting the peace, tranquillity and sefety of the country. If the Governor-General dissolves the Legislative Assembly, he shall summon a fresh Assembly within three months of such dissolution.

The Governor-General-in-Council and not the Governor-

General alone should have the power to pass ordinances. The Budget in the Legislative Assembly should follow the same procedure as the Provincial Budget *mutatis mutandis.* Reserved subjects are to include only Law, Justice and Police (except prisons), and there should be a complete separation of judicial and executive functions, at once.

The status and salary of the ministers shall be the same as that of the members of the Executive Council.

Complete provincial autonomy should be assured by terms of the statute within six years. No additional members shall be appointed without portfolios. The League disagrees with the recommendation that additional member or members may be appointed to the Provincial Executive Councils by the Governor from among his senior officials for purposes of consultation and advice only. The Governor shall not have power to summon either part of his Council separately. Power may be taken to appoint Under-Secretaries provided that the Under-Secretaries so appointed shall be from among the elected members of the Legislative Council. The Legislative Council shall consist of four-fifths elected and one-fifth nominated members. The Legislative Council shall elect its own President and Vice President. The re-transfer of transferred subjects to the list of reserved subjects in case of maladminstration shall only take place with the sanction of the Parliament. The Legislative Council shall have the right to vote the salary of ministers five years after the first Council.

The status of Ajmer-Merwara and Delhi should be that of a Regulated Province and popular government and effective control in the affairs of the local government should be granted to their people.

The percentages of recruitment in India of the public services, including the Indian Civil Service, should begin with 50 per cent, and increase by 1½ per cent annually, until the position is reviewed by the Commission. The League objects to the time scale of promotion set out in Recommendation No. 68 of the Report. All persons either recruited in England

or India should receive equal pay. No allowances to be granted to persons recruited in Europe for service in India or to those recruited in India for service in Europe.

The All-India Muslim League authorizes the Council of the League to take steps to send a deputation to England at an early date to work conjointly with the Congress deputation in the matter of reforms in accordance with the principles incorporated in the resolutions passed in this Special Session of the All-India Muslim League and to secure for the Musalmans of India due recognition of their rights for enabling them to take their proper place in the reformed political constitution of the country.

(*DELHI SESSION, 1918*)

Having regard to the fact that the Indian Musalmans take a deep interest in the fate of their co-religionists outside India, and that the collapse of the Muslim Powers of the world is bound to have an adverse influence on the political importance of the Musalmans in the country, and the annihilation of the military powers of Islam in the world cannot but have a far-reaching effect on the minds of even the loyal Musalmans of India, the All-India Muslim League considers it to be its duty to place before the Government of India and His Majesty's Government the true sentiments of the Muslim community, and requests that the British representatives at the Peace Conference will use their influence and see that in the territorial and political re-distribution to be made, the fullest consideration should be paid to the requirements of the Islamic law with regard to the full and independent control by the Sultan of Turkey, Khalifa of the Prophet, over the holy places and over the Jazirat-ul-Arab as delimitated in the Muslim books. The League further hopes that in determining the political relations of the Empire, for the future, His Majesty's Ministers shall pay the fullest consideration to the universal and deep sentiment of the Musalmans of India, and that resolute attempts should be made to effect a complete reconciliation and lasting concord between the Empire and Muslim states, based on terms of equity and justice, in the interests alike of the British Empire and the

Muslim world.

The following resolution was also carried :

The All-India Muslim League views with great dissatisfaction the unreasonable attitude of the Government in not releasing Maulana Mohammad Ali and other Muslim internees, even after the signing of the Armistice, and urges their immediate release in order to allay Muslim feelings. In view of the vague nature of the charges framed against them by the Committee of Enquiry appointed by the Government to investigate their case, the League strongly protests against the continuation of the internment of Messrs. Shaukat Ali and Mohammad Ali.

(*AMRITSAR SESSION, 1919*)

Resolution VI

In view of the strong desire of the Muslim Community to have definite provisions for the protection of its interests, this League urges upon the Government that the following safeguards be adopted in the forthcoming reforms :

(*a*) Musalmans should be adequately represented in the public services of the country.

(*b*) Musalmans should have representation on Government Universities in the same proportion as the representation accorded to Mussalmans on the Legislative Council in the province concerned may be.

(*c*) The Urdu language and Persian characters should be maintained in courts and public officers in those provinces where they are in vogue, and Urdu should be employed as the medium of primary education in the aforesaid provinces.

(*d*) Musalmans should be afforded facilities, protection and help in the observance and performance of their religious rites, ceremonies and usages without any restriction.

(*NAGPUR SESSION, 1920*)

Resolutions III

III. (a) The All-India Muslim League reaffirms the resolution passed as its Special Session in Calcutta regarding non-violent non-co-operation.

(b) The League places on record its satisfaction at the progress the non-co-operation movement has made generally, and in particular, at the boycott of the Councils by the nationalists and at the refusal to exercise their right of voting by the vast majority of the electors of the various constituencies established under the Reform Scheme; and in view of the unmistakable attitude of the electors, the League calls upon those who have secured seats on the various Councils, in direct opposition to the will of the electors, to resign their seats; and in the case of those who fail to do so, the League advises the electors to have no political connection whatsoever with the so-called representatives.

(c) The League also expresses its sense of appreciation for the response made to the call of duty by the youth of India; and while emphasizing the absolute necessity of the immediate severance of all connection with Government or Government-aided colleges and schools, calls upon the owners and trustees of all the educational institutions to forthwith give up Government aid and disaffiliate themselves from Government-recognized universities; and the League, at the same time, requests parents and guardians to withdraw their sons and wards from Government-aided or controlled institutions, without any further delay; and it also calls upon adult students to withdraw from such itstitutions.

(d) The League further urges upon the lawyers and the litigants to immediately boycott Government courts and to establish, encourage and popularize arbitration courts.

(e) Lastly, the League exhorts the people of India to encourage Indian industries by the exclusive use of *Swadeshi* goods and by establishing home industries.